

**Computer Engineering Department
Bilkent University**

CS533: Information Retrieval Systems

Assignment No. 4: Reviewing Papers (IR systems timeline papers)

March 12, 2010

Due date: March 22, 2010; Monday, by 11:59 am

Note: You are required to write a review for each paper that you are assigned. Please give two hard copies of each review that you would write, in one of them indicate your name and have additional notes for the editor (in this case it is me); the other copy is the blind review for the author. Length: you decide, but it should be at least half a page –your comments part-. The purpose of the review is to justify your rating and provide constructive criticism. While writing your review please visit hw1 and see the writing pointers provided in that assignment: <http://www.cs.bilkent.edu.tr/~canf/CS533/hwSpring10/cs533spr10hw1.pdf> .

Exceptions (please read):

1. The students who missed hw no. 1 will now do hw1 as their hw no. 4 (They are not assigned any paper to review.) Their due date is also as indicated above.
2. The following student will write a meta review, i.e., review the reviews of two groups: one group – two students reviewing the same paper, another group – two students reviewing another paper.

Ferhat Kutlu: Due date March 31, 2010; Wednesday, by 11:59 am

Review Format

Paper Number:

Title:

Reviewer:

Section I. Evaluation

1. Is the paper of interest to a reasonable segment of the information retrieval community?
☐ Yes
☐ No
2. Is the paper logically and technically correct?
☐ Yes
☐ Appears to be, but didn't check completely
☐ Only partially (see Section III)
☐ No
3. Is the title appropriate?
☐ Yes
☐ No (see Section III)
4. Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work presented?
☐ Yes
☐ No (see Section III)
5. Does the introduction clearly state the background and/or motivation in terms understandable to the non-specialist?
☐ Yes

- ☐ Probably (see Section III)
☐ No (see Section III)
6. Are the references or bibliography appropriate and complete?
☐ Yes
☐ Some additions and/or deletions required (see Section III)
☐ No (see Section III)
7. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Could be improved (see Section III)
☐ Poor (see Section III)
8. Relative to its technical content and scope, is the length of the paper appropriate?
☐ Yes
☐ No, too long (see Section III)
☐ No, too short (see Section III)
9. Is the English satisfactory?
☐ Yes
☐ No, but can easily be polished
☐ No, very poor
10. How readable is the paper for a reader who is a non-specialist in the field of this paper?
☐ Readable with ordinary effort
☐ Paper is self-contained, but a considerable effort is required
☐ Difficult
☐ Unreadable
-

Section II. Recommendation

(Here assume that the review is done for a journal or conference for publication.)

- ☐ Accept with no changes
☐ Accept if certain minor revisions are made
☐ Author(s) should prepare a major revision for a second review
☐ Reject
-

Section III. Detailed comments for the author

Please make detailed comments and suggestions for the author(s). Constructive comments are an invaluable aid to the author(s) to help in improving the overall technical quality, utility and readability of the paper. Use as much space as necessary. Please do not offend the author.

Section IV. Comments for the editors, not to be shown to the author