Paper Reviewing Guidelines

Ronald F. DeMara
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL 32816-2450
demara@mail.ucf.edu

When reading others papers, one can learn how to improve one's own scholarly papers by critiquing others. Also, see my Ph.D. Overview [1], Ph.D. Plan [2], and Technical Writing [3] documents for additional related information.

1) spend a couple of hours browsing existing papers from the conference or journal to observe the nominal level of quality
2) read the paper being reviewed over once to get general impression then let set on your mind for a couple of days
3) find some references that relate to the paper (either listed or not listed in the paper) and browse through them - challenge yourself to figure out precisely how this paper relates to the others.
4) begin formal review: go through section by section and write down in a microsoft word file your comments, questions, impressions, suggestions for everything in the paper including all text, figures, and tables. This should be about 3 paragraphs for a conference paper or 2 pages for a journal paper. When writing a review, compose a few paragraphs about if:

    a) you see any obvious errors or misconceptions … reviewers need to identify any incorrect statements or equations … there needs to be an explicit statement that "Equations were checked and appeared to be correct."

    b) Provide detailed assessment and opinions on the Diagrams, Tables, Results, etc --- if you notice anything wrong or to be improved then should write it down.

    c) the approach might be valid or unlikely to be valid … there needs to be an explicit statement that "The technique in the paper appears to be correct." or the "Technique in the paper does not appear to be correct."

    d) the approach was definitely already done before or probably not done elsewhere in same exact way

    e) what is most "interesting" about the current work, as compared to previous papers?

    f) who do you think the potential audience would be (FPGA chip designers, FPGA application users, FPGA performance evaluation, FPGA testing)?

    g) overall "impression" --- stated as if you would be interested in reading more or not
5) provide a list of any missing references you think are relevant
6) write overall summary of your evaluation: 1 paragraph

References

[1] R. F. DeMara, *Ph.D. Overview*, available at http://cal.ucf.edu/demara/advising

[2] R. F. DeMara, *Ph.D. Plan*, available at http://cal.ucf.edu/demara/advising

[3] R. F. DeMara, *Presentation Writing*, available at
http://cal.ucf.edu/demara/advising