

CS523 Project Review Guidelines. v0.1

Matthew Fricke

December 25, 2016

The review process is double-blind. Submit your review by entering a score for each section, a paragraph presenting your reasons for giving that score, and finally your recommendation.

1 Readability: Score 0-5

If the paper is ungrammatical to a degree that the content cannot be understood, let me know and you will be excused from having to complete the rest of the review.

2 Abstract: Score 0-5

1. Can the abstract be understood without reading the manuscript?
2. Does the abstract appropriately summarise the manuscript?

3 Introduction: Score 0-5

1. Is the purpose of the study clearly defined?
2. Is the purpose presented so that it is specific while also being of interest to others?
3. Is related work properly discussed and referenced?

4 Methods: Score 0-5

1. Methods should be clearly described so that another researcher could recreate the experiments.

5 Results: Score 0-5

1. Results should be presented clearly and in logical order.
2. Is the relevance of each experiment clearly explained?
3. Are all experiments linked to the appropriate methods section?

4. Are the number of experiment replicas sufficient to support the results?
5. Are any statistical methods used to validate the results (e.g. Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney)?
6. Are all figures legible with appropriate font sizes? Are the figures colour independent so they are understandable in B&W (Line styles used to complement colours)? Are figures high enough resolution?
7. Do figure captions properly describe the purpose of the figure and the experiment the figure represents?
8. Is the study purpose as described in the introduction sufficiently addressed by the results? Are there any results that are not in support of the study purpose described in the introduction?

6 Discussion: Score 0-5

1. Are all important points from the results section discussed?
2. Are limitations and unexpected results addressed?
3. Are the arguments presented logical and not overreaching?
4. Do the conclusions address the specific purpose of the study?
5. Are the conclusions of interest to others working in the same area?

7 Formatting: Score 0-5

1. Is the title clear and appropriate?
2. Are the authors names and affiliations properly formatted?
3. Are the figures displayed near where they are first referenced?
4. Are the figures discussed in the same order they are displayed?
5. Is white space used appropriately?

8 References: Score 0-5

1. Is every statement of fact properly referenced with a citation to a peer reviewed publication in a book, scientific journal, or conference proceedings? The only exceptions are: data presented in the results section produced by experiments performed by the authors and commonly known facts (e.g. the sky is blue, computers are generally faster now than in the past).
2. The references section should be formatted according to the ACM template provided.

9 Recommendation

1. Outstanding
2. Accept
3. Mild accept
4. Mild reject
5. Reject
6. Contains Plagiarism¹

¹Text or figures that are not original to the authors reproduced without citation.