

Evaluating Papers

Adrian Crăciun
Computer Science Department
West University of Timișoara,
Email: adrian.craciun@e-uvt.ro

April 2020

1 The Evaluation Process

Evaluation process:

- Submit the paper: on EasyChair(<https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=mpil2020>).
- The program committee will distribute the papers for evaluation to anonymous reviewers (each paper will be reviewed by 3 people).
- For each paper, the reviewer:
 - write an evaluation report,
 - propose a solution:
 - * (3p) STRONG ACCEPT: beyond expectations, very good, interesting/strong results, very good presentation.
 - * (2.5p) ACCEPT: good papers, strong results, good presentation, that only requires minor revisions.
 - * (2p) Weak Accept: OK paper with minor problems, that will require some revisions.
 - * (1.5p) Borderline: mostly OK, but some problems some revisions will be necessary.
 - * (1p) Weak Reject: the paper has significant problems, they need to be addressed, paper needs serious revision.
 - * (0.5p) REJECT: the paper may contain errors, other significant problems, needs to be rewritten.
 - * (0p) STRONG REJECT: blatant plagiarism.
- The program committee collects the reviewer's reports and proposals and reach a decision (made together with the reviewers), inform the author.
- The author gets the decision, together with the evaluation reports and reacts (takes into consideration the reports, addresses the problems), writes the final version of the paper ($\leq 1p$).

2 A Method to Evaluate Papers and Generate an Evaluation Report

Method for evaluation of papers as an "algorithm" (due to Bruno Buchberger).

1. *Read* the abstract, introduction, conclusions (10 mins).
2. If the paper is *in the scope* of the subject (conference, journal):
 - **then** report "the paper is in the scope", **go to** step 3,
 - **else** report "the paper is not in the scope" + justification (describe the scope, justify why it is not addressed), **stop**.
3. *Read* (superficially) the main parts of the paper (15 min) write a short summary, in your own words (≤ 5 min), describe the problems addressed and the results achieved.
4. If *presentation seems clear enough to make a fair evaluation* of the objectives and results,
 - **then** report, **go to** step 5.
 - **else** report "the presentation is too poor to make a reasonable evaluation" + justification **stop**.
5. If *results seem important*
 - **then** report "the main results of the paper are (very, quite, sufficiently ...) important" + justification + **go to** step 6.
 - **else** report "reject, the results are not important enough" + justification, **stop**.
6. If *results are non-trivial, fairly difficult to achieve, etc.*
 - **then** report "the (main, following) results are non-trivial (difficult, ingenious)", **go to** 7.
 - **else** report "reject, the results are trivial (easy, straightforward)" + justification, **stop**.
7. If *results seem original*
 - **then** report + justification, **go to** 8.
 - **else** "reject, the results are known" + justification, **stop**.
8. If there are *sufficiently many details in the paper* to check the correctness of the results,
 - **then** report, **go to** step 9.

- **else** report "the paper contains too few details to check the correctness" If, by intuition, the results seem to have a *high chance to be correct*
 - **then** report "the results seem intuitively correct", go to step 11.
 - **else** "reject, some of the results seem wrong" + justification (what?, why?), **stop**.
9. Read the paper in detail and check correctness (2-5 hrs).
10. If the paper is *technically correct* and the author seems to master the subject,
- **then** report "the author seems to master the technicalities, I have checked (exactly, superficially, not all, ...) the details of (all, some, ...) the results", make a list of minor errors and technical deficiencies, go to step 11.
 - **else** report "reject, because the paper contains (severe, major) errors" + justification, **stop**.
11. If presentation, structure, language, style are of high standard,
- **then** report, go to step 12.
 - **else** make a list of suggestions to improve presentation, structure, language, style, go to step 12.
12. Make a list of other suggestions for improving the presentation, recommend "... accept".

3 Some Remarks on the Evaluation Process

- Use your own words to generate the evaluation report.
- Don't forget to justify every decision.
- **stop** in the above method is "soft", i.e. wherever possible read it as "go to next step".
- The evaluation report is supposed to help the author improve their paper:
 - be respectful,
 - be helpful.