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Why reviewing
Ensuring scientific quality
Retraction notice on "Chocolate with high Cocoa content as a weight-loss accelerator"
Why reviewing

- Maintain **standards** of quality
- Provide **credibility** to results
- Make suggestions for **improvement**
How to review

‘I would strongly recommend to reject this paper!’
Review Process
Peer review
Peer review

Double Blind Peer Review
Elements of a review

- **Reviewer expertise**
  - 1: no knowledge to 4: expert knowledge

- **Short summary of the text**
  - “This paper presents/examines/…”

- **Contribution statement**
  - “This paper contributes … to …”

- **Strengths and weaknesses**
  - Major concerns regarding originality, significance, and validity
  - Smaller concerns (e.g., legibility of tables)
  - Suggestions for improvements

- **Overall rating / recommendation:**
  - 1: definitely reject to 5: definitely accept
Typical questions to ask

- How **relevant** is this work?
- How is the **argument flow**?
- What is **new** about this work?
- Which **problem** is this work trying to **solve**?
- Which other works does it **extend**?
- **What** did the authors **do**?
- **How** did they **do** it?
- **How valid** is their approach?
- **How relevant** are the results?
Criteria for a good paper

- **Contribution**: Which new insights does the paper contribute to the field of HCI?
- **Benefits**: What can other researchers/practitioners learn from the paper and do with it?
- **Significance**: Is the work useful? Does it have an impact?
- **Novelty/Originality**: Is the work new or are there similar prior publications?
- **Validity**: Are the conclusions justified? Is the methodology sound and analysis valid?
- **Relevance**: How good does the paper match the (HCI) audience?
- **Format**: Legibility, conciseness, clarity
Critical review

- A review is **NOT** about personal interests or criticism
- The review should focus on content and presentation

**Ethics in scientific communication**

- It is ok to consider a contribution to be superfluous or of no need to the scientific community
- It is not ok to personally judge or insult the authors
“Did you have a seizure while writing this sentence? Because I feel like I had one while reading it.”

“The authors are amateurs”

“Publication of this paper will not advance our knowledge in any shape or form, it will just result in other researchers pointing out how bad this study actually is”

“I am personally offended that the authors believed that this study had a reasonable chance of being accepted to a serious scientific journal.”
The chapter is missing large portions of related work, especially in the domains of assessing personality from various modalities, correlations with user preferences and recommendation techniques. There are several works from Ferwerda and Tkalcic that deal with various aspects of personality-based personalization. Some examples


Reviewing Rules

The authors have put a lot of **effort** in their submission, and they might be still learning.

Be **accommodating** and **respecting**, and help them improve their work.

That’s why we do reviews: to ensure **high quality**
Overall rating (Smith, 1989)

- Major results - very significant
- Good, solid, interesting work; a definite contribution
- Minor, but positive, contribution to knowledge
- Elegant and technically correct but useless
- Neither elegant nor useful, but not actually wrong
- Wrong and misleading
- The paper is so badly written that a technical evaluation is impossible
Overall rating (Zobel, 2004)

**Recommending accept**

- Be sure that the paper does not have any serious mistakes
- Convince the AC that the paper has an acceptable standard with respect to originality, significance, and validity
- Make improvements that should be made for the final print version

**Recommending reject**

- Clearly explain the mistakes and if possible, how they could be improved (for a future submission)
- Appreciate the authors’ work by indicating which parts are already good and which should be improved / discarded
- Check the paper to a reasonable level of detail
Some final comments

● Also check references, formulas, etc.
● Address the AC in your review by trying to convince her to accept/reject the paper, don’t address the authors: “In their paper, the authors present an approach to…”
● Reviewed papers must remain confidential
● Conflicts of interests: reviewers should not review papers of people they worked with
You will be a reviewer!
Trade in your paper

→ **submit anonymized** final paper until 18.06.19

→ you will be assigned two peer papers
Write reviews

→ **read** the two assigned papers

→ write a **review** on each paper guided by these slides and your own intuition

→ **submit** as PDFs until 28.06.19 via Uniworx
Don’t worry

Your review won’t influence any grades!
It will only help the authors improve their work.
→ provide constructive feedback

Be helpful and nice!
Make use of your reviews!

→ your supervisor will write a meta review
→ use your reviews to improve your paper
→ **submit** your final perfect A* paper until 12.07.19 via Uniworx
## Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.04.19</td>
<td>Kick-Off</td>
<td>session - compulsory attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.05.19</td>
<td>1st draft paper submission</td>
<td>get feedback meet your supervisor before!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.06.19</td>
<td>60s pitch slides submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.06.19</td>
<td>60s pitches</td>
<td>session - compulsory attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.06.19</td>
<td>Review-ready paper submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.06.19</td>
<td>Review submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.07.19</td>
<td>Final paper submission</td>
<td>get feedback meet your supervisor before!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.07.19</td>
<td>1st draft slides submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.07.19</td>
<td>Final slides submission</td>
<td>practice talk with your supervisor!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.07.19</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>session - compulsory attendance, about ~5 hours!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q & A