Assignment 3
Individual peer review report

IT3010 –Empirical research methodologies
in IT and digitalization[1]
(Spring 2022)

Contribution to final grade	10%
Deadline	April 8, 2022
Maximum word count	500 (excluding front-page and references)
What to deliver	Submission in EasyChair + One PDF file in Blackboard.

Learning objectives in focus[2]:

Learning objective	What you will learn
8	You will learn to read and evaluate a research paper and write a constructive peer review report.

---

[1] https://www.ntnu.edu/studies/courses/IT3010

[2] See Blackboard for an overview of learning goals. This overview also shows you what part of the syllabus can help you achieve the learning objective.

NTNU

Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Introduction

The peer review should both be delivered on EasyChair and on Blackboard. An EasyChair invitation will be sent to your registered email with a link to the paper.

For Blackboard: Make a PD file of your review report, add the front-page template to it before uploading it to Blackboard as **one PDF file**.

Writing a review report

The goal of the review report you write is to help the authors of the paper improve the paper as much as possible based on your comments. Try to see the potential in the paper you review! Also make sure that you have the EReMCIS call for paper at hand. You should evaluate according to the call for paper.

Rating

Rate the paper according to the following evaluation criteria based on your opinion and experience (note that this is only an exercise in giving a paper a rating. You don't need to worry that the other group's paper will actually be rejected as a deliverable in IT3010!):

- 3: Strong Accept: This is a good paper where the argument, the motivation, and the novelty of the contribution are clearly stated; the research questions are answered; the argument is well grounded in the academic literature; the methodology is appropriate; the (early) findings are clearly supported and discussed.
- 2: Accept: This is still a good paper but where one of the requirements for Strong Accept does not hold and needs to be fixed.
- 1: Weak Accept: This is an acceptable paper but more than one of the requirements for Strong Accept do not hold and need to be fixed.
- 0: Neutral: You are unsure if this is a good paper because of several flaws. You think the paper needs revisions.
- -1: Weak Reject: You believe that this paper has several flaws and needs revisions to meet the "Weak Accept" level.
- -2: Reject: You believe that this paper needs substantial revisions to meet the "Weak Accept" level.
- -3: Strong Reject: You believe that the paper should be entirely rewritten to meet at least the "Weak Accept" level.

Writing the feedback

In the text field in the EasyChair form (and Blackboard file) you must thoroughly explain and motivate your evaluation.

Follow this structure:

- A short summary of your understanding of the paper and its contribution (max 5 lines)
- A short summary of the rationale for your rating and evaluation (max 5 lines).
- A more exhaustive explanation of your evaluation including:
    - (a) a discussion of the positive aspects

- o (b) a discussion of the flaws/negative aspects. Elaborate on the (b) part by substantiating negative comments. If you claim that the work is not original, please give specific references to the earlier allegedly similar work. Add the source for any reference to additional work that you might recommend.
- o c) Concluding remarks and summary of evaluation and possibilities for improvement, particularly if language proof reading is needed.
- o d) Reviewer's confidence: rate how familiar you think you are with the topic addressed by the paper and its research methods.

Confidential remarks

Here you can write additional comments to the symposium organizers (IT3010 teaching staff) that will not be visible to the authors. You can add for example additional comments to back up your evaluation or explain why you rated yourself in a specific way in the "Reviewer's confidence" field. This does not count towards the total word count.

General tips

- Be specific
- Avoid vague feedback
- Give suggestions for improvement
- Justify your suggestions

You can also see this web page for other tips:

- https://blog.babak.no/2017/05/09/tips-for-the-first-time-academic-publication-referee/

Assessment criteria

This table shows what we look into when assessing your deliverable.

Section	Evaluation criteria
Rating	- Does the rating correspond to the review results? Is it a fare rating?
Contribution of the paper	- How well does the candidate manage to recognize the contribution of the reviewed paper? - How well does the candidate describe the contribution?
Rationale for evaluation	- Does the candidate manage to sum up the main strengths and weaknesses? - Is the rationale in-line with the call for paper?
Detailed evaluation	- Does the candidate list positive aspects of the paper convincingly? - Does the candidate list negative aspects of the paper convincingly? - Are comments constructive? Do they contribute to improve the paper? - Are major issues separated from minor issues?