# Guidelines for reviewing a research article

**1. Originality:** Is the paper sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Is the research problem an important one? Is this a novel combination of familiar techniques? Is it clear how this work differs from previous contributions? Is related work adequately referenced?

**2. Quality:** Is the paper technically sound? Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? Are its claims backed up? Does the paper offer a contribution in support of or against a well-known literature? Does the paper back up a theoretical idea with some implementation? Does it offer evaluation results of the implementation work? Is this a complete piece of work, or merely a position paper? Are the authors careful (and honest) about evaluating both the strengths and weaknesses of the work?

**3. Relevance:** Is the work reported important? Does it advance the state of the art? Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?

4. **Presentation:** Is the paper clearly written? Is the vocabulary appropriate? Is the content complete and fully congruent? Is the paper well organized? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe the proposed protocols clearly? Are the results described and evaluated?

**5. Recommendation:** In case you think paper is acceptable in its present form (rejection), your comments should help authors understand how they might improve their submissions in the future. In case you think paper can be accepted, your comments should help authors improve the paper for the final conference proceedings.

**6. Summary of contribution (shown to the authors):** Your written review should begin by summarizing the main ideas of the paper and then discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the paper. It is tempting to include only weaknesses in your review. However, it is important to also mention and take into account the strengths. You can include a list of arguments pro and con of acceptance.

**7. Detailed comments (shown to the authors):** Here you need to provide feedback to authors. Describe in detail what you think is important about it and how it will contribute to theory or practice. If you are sure the paper should be rejected, you should explain why, politely, but in detail. However, your comments should be related, specific and polite, avoiding vague complaints. As you write a review, think of the types of reviews that you like to get for your papers. Even negative reviews can be polite and constructive!

**Special Note:**
A good review is supportive, constructive, thoughtful, and fair. It identifies both strengths and weaknesses, and offers concrete suggestions for improvements. It acknowledges the reviewer's biases where appropriate, and justifies the reviewer's conclusions.