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Review Process

Gunter Saake
Common Mistakes in StudConf Reviews

- Review in different language than the paper
- No summary of the paper
- Mixing points in favor and points against the paper
- Starting with minor points instead of major points
- Proposals for whole sentences (they authors cannot use them when the reviewer is anonymous)
- Evaluation only in bullet points (lack of full sentences, descriptions, explanations)
- Evaluation for each section separately
- Review too short (e.g., paragraph only)
- Feedback too detailed (you will not get co-authorship)
Mistakes in StudConf Reviews

- "Please consider to use MS Word's spellchecker before submitting any paper to anyone."
- "Please summarize the results [...]"
- "Can you extend the future work part of this section?"
- "Insgesamt hat das Papier [...] viel Potential, benötigt aber noch ein bis 2 Iterationen."
- "Mir war nicht klar warum du das brauchst."
- "Allerdings MUSS bei empirischen studien immer eine Section Threads to validity drin sein"
- "Proceedings of the 6th international conference on -> Proc. Int'l. Conf. on ... "
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Mistakes in StudConf Reviews

• „locations can be omitted, such as New York, NY, USA“
• „When presenting a tool and its website, a footnote is more convenient than a real citation.“
• „there are some citations that don't seem to be published on a conference. Those citations should be avoided.“
• „the presented work shows pretty relevant results“
• „it looks better, if you write the references in one bracket. [2],[3] -> [2,3]“
• „Please get in mind, if this is beneficial“
• „Can you write the word ‘viewframe’ in italic style, because it is it very important“
Mistakes in StudConf Reviews

• „given in figure 2“, „and equation 6“
• „This section could be shortened.”
• „the author give a short overview“
• „is missing […] a textual reference to the next section“
• „References are ordered as they are mentioned in the text, not alphabetically.”
• „The paper is incomplete […] !!!“
• „Very often, authors put a comma after the “e.g.,” or “i.e.,”. As far as I know, that is not correct.“
• „I would combine sections: future work and conclusion.“
• „Useless, missing, and duplicate content“
Mistakes in StudConf Reviews

- „related work würde ich vorne besser finden“

- Example of a whole review:
  „viele wortwiederholungen
gutes Englisch nur kleine Fehler
w.l.o.g. oder w.r.t. ??
bisschen mehr auf die formeln eingehen
gute Struktur und gute Recherche in Verbindung mit einer guten Beschreibung“
Review

• Summary (~ 50-200 words)
• Evaluation, pros & cons (~ 100-1000 words)
• Rating
  • A: Good paper. I will champion it at the PC meeting.
  • B: OK paper, but I will not champion it.
  • C: Weak paper, though I will not fight strongly against it.
  • D: Serious problems. I will argue to reject this paper.
• Confidence
  • X: I am an expert in the subject area of this paper.
  • Y: I am knowledgeable in the area, though not an expert.
  • Z: I am not an expert. My evaluation is that of an informed outsider.
Evaluation Criteria (examples)

- Does the paper match the topic of the conference?
- Do title and abstract reflect the content of the paper?
- Is the paper well structured?
- Is the contribution of the paper clear? Is the motivation clear?
- Do sections contain the content promised in section titles?
- Is there a consistent recurring theme or does the author jump from idea to idea?
- Are all background information necessary for understanding the paper provided?
- Are there any unnecessary information/sections?
- Are arguments well supported by references? Are references complete and suited?
- Are examples/figures/tables used adequately to support understanding the paper?
- Is the reasoning of the paper correct?
- Is the paper well written (language, style)?
Typical comment patterns

- “the objectives are unclear”
- “too little beef”
- “the authors seem to ignore ...”
- “… so what?”
- “the paper fails to deliver what is promises”
- “unsubstantiated claims”
- “opinion paper...”
- “premature...”
- “the paper provides little evidence that the results do apply in real settings”, “scaleability is questionable”, etc
- “evaluation is weak”
Example Review

>>> Summary of the submission <<<
The paper presents a formal approach for X. The approach determines whether one X is Y with regard to Z. A
formalization of X is used. The comparison is performed using a SAT solver. The approach does not enforce Y
to contain Z.

>>> Evaluation <<<
Pros:
• The paper is well written.
• The problem is easy to understand, and the solution is elegant.
• The solution is shown to scale to large models.
Cons:
• The practical value of the approach is not demonstrated. One could get the impression that the paper is only a
theoretical exercise
• The paper neglects state-of-the-art comparision with other X algorithm for similar models.

Overall, the paper addresses an important problem. The idea of doing X with Y is novel. The related work focuses on
X solely.
Unfortunately, it does neglect X. For example, similar work has been proposed for Y. It remains unclear, whether the
results produced by the approach correspond with the modeller’s intuition (or the real changes) in most of the
cases or not.
Section X explains the algorithm, but X is not clear. Wouldn’t Y be Z?
In conclusion …

Suggestions for improvement:
I suggest to explain X in more detail in this section as this is a central point for your paper (partly, you do this in
Section 4). Presently, only X is illustrated. You should present examples of Y and Z as well.
Section 3:
Your approach to declare X as Y appears overly simplistic to me and may produce results that are counterintuitive.
Consider, for instance, … see paper Z by Y.
Minor comments:
A different kind of evaluation would be more important here than the performance evaluation. You should provide …
The paper broaches the issue of creating hybrid CPU/GPU query plans in database systems. It offers an approach to calculate a time optimized hybrid query plan based on a scheduling framework, which also includes the memory copy costs. The given algorithm creates not in all cases an optimal plan, because it uses a greedy strategy.

In section 1 an introduction is given and the structure of the paper is shown. Section 2 gives a short background and discusses the related work. The Problem is mentioned in section 3. Section 4 introduces the decision model, which is used in section 5 to explain the algorithm. Section 6 lists and discusses future work and section 7 gives a conclusion.

Pros:
- The paper is well written and structured.
- The problem is carefully worded and the solution is comprehensible shown.
- The related work is good presented and differentiated.

Cons:
- The value of the topic is not mention. Time relevant data operation are normally done by large computing systems (e.g. blade systems in a computing cluster) without a GPU or with a powerless GPU, other approaches like in memory databases are more relevant in this area
- No examples with real world data are given… How much time is saved by using this approach in contrast using a pure CPU query plan?

Overall the paper addresses an interesting problem and gives a good first approach to calculate hybrid query plans. The description of the algorithm is comprehensible and the paper is good structured. The regard of the memory copy costs topic is creditable. Unfortunately the paper is not arranged to other research areas, like in-memory databases. Examples, e.g. measured time, are not given and a validation of the approach with real world data is missing, too.

Suggestions for improvement:
- Paper is not written in IEEE proceeding 8.5x11-inche, Two-Column Format
- In the introduction the structure of the paper is not completely described, section 6 and 7 are missing
- A citation for the opinion that GPU have more computing power than CPU is missing
- In the beginning of section 5 it is said that the algorithm creates not any time an optimal query plan, but later it is written “…we construct the optimal query plan…”
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