Review Guideline

Software Engineering Seminar SS 2011

This guideline is prepared to help you reviewing fellow student's seminar paper in an objective way. The purpose of the review is not to evaluate the author but his/her seminar paper. Therefore, your review should be directed at the paper, not the author. There is no page limit, but keep the report as short as possible. The review is not about telling stories; it is about critiquing author's work with scientific conciseness.

Start your review with the following information:

Paper to Review (Author/Title):

Name of the reviewer:

Reviewer's Email:

Follow the following structure for the report:

1. Brief summary of the seminar paper

The objective of this section is to convince the author and his/her supervisor that you have read the entire seminar paper carefully. This will convince them that your criticisms are objective and intended to help the author to improve the seminar paper. This section should be a brief summary (a few sentences in your own words) of the seminar paper and the major contributions of the seminar paper (do not simply quote author's own abstract)

2. General Issues

In this section, you mention the issues that the author needs to address in his/her seminar paper in general. If certain issues are repeatedly present in the paper, give a specific example so that author can correct the same in other parts of the paper.

      a. Language: issues related with grammar, spelling, punctuation, frequent use of long, ambiguous sentences etc.

      b. Format, layout, style: Does the paper followed the suggested style (LNCS style) and applied it consistently throughout the paper?

      c. Structure: issues related with the structure of the paper – i.e. organization and clarity of the structure of the paper.

3. Specific issues

In this section, address the following sub-points with one or a few sentences and - if possible –suggest the author how he/she can address/improve the specific issue if it is not addressed sufficiently.

a. Goals/Aims: Are the goals/aims of the research sufficiently explained at the beginning of the paper?

b. Presentation:
- Does the paper tell a cohesive story i.e. how clear and coherent is the paper? Are the arguments cohesive?
- Do the title, abstract, key words, introduction and conclusions accurately and consistently reflect the major point(s) of the paper?
- Is the writing concise, easy to follow, interesting?

c. Length: Is the paper concise enough? What portions of the paper should be expanded? Condensed? Combined? Deleted? (Don't advise an overall shortening by X %. Be specific)

d. Research methods: Are the research methods described clearly enough so that the work could be repeated by someone else?

e. Clarity: Is the presented idea/approach clearly explained (or are there references to more in-depth discussions)?

f. Result presentation: Are the findings from the research clearly stated? When results are stated in the text of the paper, can you easily verify them by examining tables and figures? Are any of the results counter-intuitive? Are all tables and figure clearly labeled? Well planned? Too complex? Necessary?

g. Citation: Are all relevant references cited? Are they provided for all assertions of facts not supported by the article itself?

h. Is the goal/aim of the paper reached and sufficiently supported by the results presented.

4. Other issues

In this section, you mention all other issues that you think important to address in the paper.