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
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