# **[1] 论文审稿等级简述：**

* 5 分： accept 表示对文章强烈的支持，在审稿时很少出现
* 4 分： weak accept 文章可以接收，小改
* 3 分： borderline 中间态度
* 2 分： weak reject 论文当前不可以接受，但可以修改后重新投
* 1 分： reject 拒稿，在审稿时很少出现

# **[2]论文审稿流程：**

1）用自己的话简要概括论文内容(具体格式如下）：

第一句话，先总结论文大致做了一件什么工作；

然后用一到两句话描述文章所采用的方法或算法，若文章有理论分析，还需从理论角度介绍文章所做工作，如是否有证明研究问题为NP-hard，是否有证明最优性等；

最后需概括论文的实验结果；

2）概括论文的优缺点（可从以下几点进行说明，**注意需简要概括总结**）：

①Idea 的创新性：判断论文选题是否创新，可以通过查看已有的文献及相关领域工作，比较得出论文的创新程度；（是否提出了全新的问题，或者论文的工作是否应用于一个新的场景、或者针对同一问题是否通过不同角度来解决。）

②技术贡献: 可以从论文是否证明了现有研究问题是一个 np -hard的问题；或者能够将研究问题归纳到 np -hard问题；以及文章是否详细说明了算法最终结果与最优解的界等方面来判断技术贡献是否达标。

③文章的组织逻辑和算法逻辑链：算法逻辑是否合理，即解决问题的方法是否可行。

④文章内容细节：文章整体排版是否专业，如是否有大量的图表数量、图表内容的安排是否整洁等，在内容上对算法是否解释得足够清晰。

⑤系统实现：若只是简单的仿真，或仅从仿真平台上验证，则结果验证的实用性不强；一般标准是需要有在相关平台上的实现验证。（但如果文章的理论贡献特别突出，系统实现上的要求则可以放宽一些。）

3）展开对文章的具体评论，需针对具体文章展开论述自己的见解；（注此步骤为重点）

4）给出组内每人对论文的评分。

**[注意事项]**

**\*论文审稿过程中语言谦逊，即使自己认为论文存在诸多不足之处，在写审稿意见时要先说优点再说缺点，欲抑先扬，不可只说缺点不足。**

**\*通常审稿接收率在20%，比如拿到7篇待审稿的文章，通常只有2篇是可以接受的。**

# **[3]审稿意见示例：**

# Contributions (What are the major issues addressed in the paper? Do you consider them important? Comment on the novelty, creativity,impact, and technical depth in the paper.)

In this paper, the authors statistically analyze the status of link connection in mission driven IoT. Machine learning algorithms are adopted to predict the dynamic spatial-temporal link availability. Based on the exploited link status information from statistical analysis, a predictive routing algorithm is proposed to improve the network performance. The proposed design is evaluated through simulation. Evaluation results show that the overall network performance is enhanced by up to 36.7%. The network improvement in routing comes from the exploited opportunistic link information exploited by machine learning.

# Strengths (What are the major reasons to accept the paper?)

1. The idea is interesting and the problem investigated by authors are novel.(e.g. First of this type on this problem, Improvement over prior work)
2. The technical contribution is clear and solid.
3. The authors implement their design is real-world scenarios/testbed.
4. The paper is well organized and easy to follow.
5. Evaluate the data set (e.g. Use of a very considerable data set to test the algorithm, System applied to a large real data set, huge data, Large-scale real-world dataset, A sampled dataset will be shared with the community.)
6. The paper shows extremely high effort in collecting data and implementation.
7. The paper has extensive evaluation and comparison with baseline techniques with different sensitivity analysis cases.
8. Design makes intuitively sense, well written paper with many illustrative figures
9. Evaluations are detailed and thorough.

# Weaknesses (What are the major reasons NOT to accept the paper?)

1. Given the state of the art, the novelty of this paper is not enough. (e.g. Not clear what the novelty in the proposed methods are compared to the many existing methods, The related work section is quite short, more like a list, and does not convey this paper's novelty, Treatment of prior work is incomplete, results making sense but not surprising)
2. The technical contribution is not enough. (e.g. Proposed techniques are relatively straightforward. )
3. The experiment results are not sufficient. (e.g. Limited discussion of advantages of results)
4. The paper is hard to follow. The writing of this paper could be improved.
5. Part of the statements are overclaimed. (e.g. Unclear and unconvincing evaluation.)

# Detailed Comments (Please provide detailed comments that will help the TPC assess the paper and help provide feedback to theauthors.)

1. Compared with traditional approaches which utilize statistical analysis (e.g., ETX) to measure link status (including spatial-temporal link availability), the proposed approach adopts machine learning approaches to predict the dynamic spatial-temporal link availability. Some extra interesting and important link information is exploited and this information is helpful in improving the routing performance.
2. The prediction results of different machine learning algorithms have different performance in different scenarios. For mission-driven IoTs, there are multiple different such kinds of networks (i.e., different scenarios) and these networks have different characteristics. While the adopted machine learning approach works well for the oviedo/asturies-er dataset (composed of real traces from the Fire Department of Asturias), I don’t think the same approach works well for other mission-driven IoT scenarios. The authors may overclaim that the Statistical Analysis Aided Routing Algorithm works for QoS in Mission-Driven IoTs if machine-learning approach is adopted.
3. The authors are expected to clearly explain why the proposed machine-learning algorithm works well for link availability prediction for the specific routing task in the Mission-Driven IoT for the Fire Department. What’s the rationale behind it?
4. Some minor issues: (i) Multiple figures don’t have Legend, e.g., the Y axis of figure 3(a)-(d). (ii) The fonts in these figures are too small to read as well.