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Why did you write the review?

Did you receive feedback on the reviews you wrote?

Typical experiences of graduate students

- write reviews for a course
- write sub-reviews for your professor
- write reviews for a workshop

If you haven’t had much experience, find a way to integrate that into your training as a researcher.
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Matthew B. Dwyer
Writing Paper Reviews
Your opinion

What is the goal of the paper review process?
Their opinion

Some stakeholders in the review process include authors, reviewers, PC chairs, Journal editors, and publishing organizations (e.g., ACM, IEEE). I informally polled Editors of top SE journals, PC chairs of top SE conferences, and...
Their opinion

Some stakeholders in the review process
Their opinion

Some stakeholders in the review process

- authors
- reviewers
- PC chairs
- Journal editors
- publishing organizations (e.g., ACM, IEEE)
- the community
Some stakeholders in the review process

- authors
- reviewers
- PC chairs
- Journal editors
- publishing organizations (e.g., ACM, IEEE)
- *the community*

I informally polled . . .

- Editors of top SE journals
- PC chairs of top SE conferences
What is the goal of the review process?
What is the goal of the review process?

Is this a trick question?
What is the goal of the review process?

To ensure that timely and interesting ideas are published that have the potential to advance the field.
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To ensure quality within the field (e.g., to avoid plagiarism, duplication, that scholarly standards are met)
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To help to select the best papers for the conference.
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To filter out most of the worst papers from appearing in the conference.
What is the goal of the review process?

To provide useful feedback to authors so that they can improve their work.
What is the goal of the review process?

To help develop/grow/train the community.
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It depends …

- on the goals of the venue (inclusive vs. exclusive)
- on the review process (single vs. multi-round)
- on the time available to perform reviews
- on the number of submissions
- on the size of the reviewer pool
- on the quality of the reviewers
- …
Any thoughts or comments?
Competing concerns

Scaling to cope with the modern conference/journal environment

Making accept/reject decisions

Young researchers seeking to establish themselves

Providing constructive feedback to authors

Inclusiveness in the reviewer pool
What is a good review?

According to Prem Devanbu (FSE'06 PC chair)

- Evaluates the importance/relevance of the problem as listed by the authors. Authors of a paper may not agree with your conclusion, but it is vital that they understand your rationale.
- Lists the claims, and judges if they are applicable to the problem, and their expected importance/applicability/usefulness.
- Describes how the authors validate the claims, and evaluates the validation.
- Gives specific suggestions to improve the writing.
- Suggests specifically any relevant related work the authors should include.
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- facilitates the accept/reject decision making process
- does not sit on the fence
- clearly and concisely justifies its position
- assesses the quality, novelty, value of a paper
- detects work that is incorrect, not novel, ... 
- provides constructive and actionable feedback to authors
- identifies missing related work
- detailed comments about the presentation
- suggests new questions/directions to explore
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This paper presents a ... technique based on X and Y.

Extensive experimental evaluation is performed. The results suggest that the ... are of higher quality than using X alone. The proposed optimizations have significant effects in improving the performance.

Pros:
+ The paper is well written. The structure is very clear especially in the evaluation section.
+ The paper is well motivated. ...
+ The evaluation is extensive and the results are relatively convincing.

Cons:
- The proposed approach depends on X. ... It is true that more ... can refute ..., but the discovery of additional ... depends on X itself.
- The experiment subjects used are relatively small (100-600 LOC). ...
Questions:
* How does it work with other ... techniques?
* Can we improve the quality of ... by looking into X rather than treating X as a black box?

To summarize, the paper has a clear technical contribution and the results are encouraging. I suggest acceptance.

Minor comments/typos:
Page 3, left column, "... A1 ...". Should it be "A2"?
...
What do you like or dislike about this review?
What I like about this review

Structure makes it easy to pick out the key elements

Clearly states pros/cons

Reaches an accept/reject conclusion

Suggests avenues for more/deeper work

Specific recommendations for improvements
OVERALL EVALUATION: -1 (weak reject)

----------- REVIEW -----------

This paper presents a study for understanding X. The authors report the designed study which reveals Y. The study also identifies some strategies to support newcomers; even though it was not yet completed and remaining experiments to obtain these results on strategy. The writing of the paper is good.
What do you like or dislike about this review?
What I dislike about this review

Doesn’t reach or justify an accept/reject conclusion

Does not clearly states pros/cons, in fact it seems rather positive in spite of the rating

There is no structure so it is hard to tease out the key points that the reviewer is making

No suggestions for improvement
My personal conference review process

Two pass process

- read papers, take notes, and categorize them
- write reviews using category-specific treatment

When reading I look for the
- new idea
- is it clearly and accurately described
- is there enough evidence provided so that I can see its value
- can other people build on it

Categories
- weak Looks to have a killer flaw
- solid Looks like a winner
- other Need to look deeper, outside my expertise, . . .
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My review writing approach is different for each category.

For weak papers:
- Find something positive to say.
- Substantiate the weakness (e.g., cite work that does this already).
- Skip the minor comments.

For solid papers:
- Crisply state the key ideas and their value.
- Help authors temper/substantiate findings.
- Focus on presentation issues.

These are the easy cases.
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For other papers

read related papers to determine novelty/value
go through details/proofs multiple times
don’t leave the details for other people

what information do you need from experts to help decide?
solicit expert opinions yourself
inform chairs/editor of the need for expertise
integrate that information into your review
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- read related papers to determine novelty/value
- go through details/proofs multiple times
- don’t leave the details for other people

... that are outside your area of expertise
- what information do you need from experts to help decide?
- solicit expert opinions yourself
- inform chairs/editor of the need for expertise
- integrate that information into your review
My personal journal review process

Only accept papers for which I am an expert reviewer

Don’t focus as much on categorization (accept/reject)

Ask for more work if it is needed
  ● needed to make it publishable
  ● needed to turn an acceptable paper into a great paper

Ask specific questions of the authors
  ● exploit multi-round reviewing to get the best out of the paper

Clearly distinguish necessary changes from suggestions
  ● this is not needed in most conference processes
  ● a necessary change means conference reject
Closing Thoughts

I clearly spend too much time reviewing
I clearly spend too much time reviewing

Spend time thinking about reviewing
- it is a professional obligation (the give-receive balance)
- accept reviewing that you can do well (topic, volume)
- talk to others about their personal review process
- develop your own process
- analyze reviews you have received that were valuable
- seek feedback on your reviews (friends, advisor, chairs)
Some Crazy Ideas

Disclose reviewer information, i.e., sign reviews

Crowd-source reviews

Share paper reviews across venues
  • a rejected FSE paper has its reviews forwarded to ICSE

Enforce a balance in giving/receiving reviews
  • for every paper you submit you owe 3 reviews

Boost the signal-to-noise-ratio in the field
  • cap the number of papers one can submit in a year
  • cap the number of papers one can publish in their career
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