

PAT 514 (Winter 2025)

Contemporary Software Techniques in Performing Arts Technology

How to review a paper?

Instructor: Hao-Wen Dong



SCHOOL OF MUSIC, THEATRE & DANCE
PERFORMING ARTS TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Reading

- **Required**

- [How to Write a Review](#) by Mema Roussopoulos
- [Some Advice About Journal Reviewing](#) by David Huron

- **Optional**

- [So You're a Program Committee Member Now](#) by Ken Hinckley
- [ICCV2023 - Additional Tips for Writing Good Reviews](#)
- Reviewer guidelines for [ISMIR](#), [IEEE SPS](#), [ICASSP 2025](#), [CVPR 2024](#), [ICCV 2023](#)

Discussion

- Have you been **invited as a reviewer?**
- How do we know **if we are qualified to review a paper?**

How to Write a Review (Roussopoulos)

- **Relevance:** How relevant is the paper to the conference?
- **Presentation:** How well-written is the paper? Is it totally incomprehensible or lucid and eloquent?
- **Originality:** How novel is the paper? Are the technical ideas presented new?
- **Correctness:** Is the paper technically correct? Are the experiments performed or the analysis presented valid?
- **Confidence:** How well-versed are you, the reviewer, in this area? Are you an expert in the field and confident your feedback is correct or are you unfamiliar with the field and unsure of your feedback?
- **Overall:** What is your overall rating for this paper? Do you enthusiastically support acceptance of this paper into the conference, or would you be embarrassed to be on a Program Committee that accepted a paper like this?

How to Write a Review: **Review Format** (Roussopoulos)

- **Provide a short summary of the paper** (1-2 paragraphs).
- **List the strengths of this paper** (in bullet form).
 - Another way this can be phrased: list reasons why this paper should be accepted into the conference. Aim to list at least 2-3 strengths.
- **List the weaknesses of this paper** (in bullet form).
 - Why should this paper be rejected? You should have at least 2-3 weaknesses, along with justifications for why you think these are weaknesses and ways you think the paper could be improved to correct these weaknesses.

Some Advice About Journal Reviewing (Huron)

- If you are an active scholar — submitting and publishing journal articles — it follows that **you should do your part by contributing to the review process** as well. That's what **peer review** means.
- In an equitable world, over the course of your career, you should expect to **write two or three peer reviews for every article you submit.**

Review Format

- Recommendation
- Summary
- Major concerns
- Detailed comments

Recommendation

- **Accept outright** (accept as is)
- **Accept pending minor revisions**
- **Revise and resubmit** (major revision)
- **Reject**

Summary

- In about a paragraph, you should describe the paper **in your own words**. The purpose is to **show that you understood the manuscript**.
- **Don't be afraid to say you had trouble understanding the paper.**
 - Example: **"If I understand the paper correctly,** the author(s) ..."

Major Concerns

- It is useful to **present the concerns in their order of importance.**
- In your recommendation, you may already allude to **a particularly onerous problem that you expand on in this section.**

Detailed Comments

- Simple problems such as spelling errors, confusing sentence structure, recommendations that the author(s) cite other existing research, etc.
- Example
 - pg.7/lines 10-11 “Our results establish that ...” Please replace by “Our results are consistent with the view that ...”

Some Advice About Journal Reviewing (Huron)

- It is common for new reviewers to feel unqualified.
 - You may feel that you really don't know very much about the specific area of research addressed in the manuscript.
 - **Unfortunately, there are simply not enough experts in the world.**
 - **All scholars must leave their comfort zone, otherwise new topics or fields wouldn't be able to emerge or flourish.**

Some Advice About Journal Reviewing (Huron)

- **The most common mistake for new reviewers is to be overly critical.**
- **Be helpful.** Instead of saying “Why did you do this?” — offer specific advice.
 - Tell the author what to do to bring the work up to sufficient quality.
- **Be circumspect about asking for “addition work.”**
 - There is no such thing as a definitive study, so there is no end to the number of follow-up studies or follow-up issues that can be addressed.

My Review Template

- **Summary** (1 paragraph; 3-5 sentences)
- **Strengths** (2-5 bullet points)
- **Weaknesses** (2-5 bullet points)
- **Justification of the Overall Evaluation** (1 paragraph; 1-3 sentences)
- **Comments & Suggestions**

Example Review Form

I am an expert on the topic of the paper

Agree

The title and abstract reflect the content of the paper

Agree

The paper discusses, cites and compares with all relevant related work

Agree

Readability and paper organization

Agree

The paper adheres to [REDACTED] submission guidelines

Yes

Relevance of the topic to [REDACTED]

Strongly agree

Scholarly/scientific quality

Agree

Novelty of the paper

Agree

Reproducibility

Agree

Pioneering proposal

Agree

Reusable insights

Agree

Write ONE line (in your own words) with the main take-home message from the paper

This paper is of award-winning quality

No

Potential to generate discourse

Disagree

Overall evaluation

Weak accept

Example Review Format

Summary

[Redacted Summary Text]

Strengths

- [Redacted Strength 1]
- [Redacted Strength 2]
- [Redacted Strength 3]
- [Redacted Strength 4]

Weaknesses

- [Redacted Weakness 1]
- [Redacted Weakness 2]

Justification of the Overall Evaluation

[Redacted Justification Text]

Comments & Suggestions

- [Redacted Comment 1]
- [Redacted Comment 2]
- [Redacted Comment 3]
- [Redacted Comment 4]
- [Redacted Comment 5]
- [Redacted Comment 6]
- [Redacted Comment 7]
- [Redacted Comment 8]

Discussion

- **Why should we accept a reviewer invitation?**
- **Why is the academia adopting the peer review system?**