Absurdly short intro to reviewing a paper

Přemek Brada
2023

Why (the purpose of review)

- **paper**: improve, correct shortcomings, help finalize for publishing
- **author**: get feedback from (possibly better informed) peer(s)
- **publisher**: weed out irrelevant and bad papers
- **community**: keep high enough standards of research and published results

- I.e. ensure (at least some level of) quality of published knowledge

How #1 (reviewing a paper)

- first read to understand, second read to review
- scribble on paper / note in PDF => plain text, references to sections/parag's

- does paper **title** correspond to (represent) whole content?
- does **abstract** cover context-problem-approach-solution-validation?
- is **structure** of whole text logical (from preliminaries to conclusions)?
- is **presentation** clear, does it help understanding (wording, grammar and usage, style, headings, figures and tables, references)?
- does author correctly **reference** (and discuss) related works?
- are there no errors in the **technical** aspects (assumptions, methodology, equations and proofs, experiment design and execution, validation and discussion of results, conclusions drawn, …)?

How #2 (academic management of reviews)

- single blind (authors known to reviewer, not vice versa)
- double blind (author names and references hidden, reviewers hidden)

- submissions = set of papers in
- programme committee = set of reviewers
- assignment => M:N, usually 2-3 reviewers : 1 paper
- M recommendations (reviewers) => 1 decision (PC/track chair)
  - journal: accept / minor review / major review / reject
  - conference: strong accept / weak accept / borderline / weak reject / strong reject

- paper modifications (journal: checked, conference: expected)
- “camera ready” paper version

Some sources of help and information

- Types of peer review: https://www.elsevier.com/reviewer/what-is-peer-review
- How to give good feedback as reviewer: https://www.elsevier.com/connect/theyve-got-it-all-wrong-how-to-give-constructive-feedback-in-peer-review
- Bad review ethic: https://www.elsevier.com/connect/when-reviewing-goes-wrong-the-ugly-side-of-peer-review