

Paper Review: (Paper Title)

(Your Name)

(Date)

This file serves two purposes: (i) it is a template for a simple L^AT_EX document, and (ii) it is a template for a (mock) paper review. We say “mock” since the papers we are reviewing are not current conference or journal submissions, but in fact papers that were published in the scientific community quite some time ago. The goal is to combine the pleasure of reading these papers with the desire to learn something about critically reading and evaluating them. This combination is not ideal, but the overlap in these two activities is large.

Make sure you add the full reference of the paper you are reviewing to the bibliography, and cite it early on in the review text, so it is clear what is being reviewed, e.g. [2].

1 Summary of Contents

- State what the paper is about, and what it claims to contribute. Paraphrase in your own words—do not copy sentences verbatim from the paper. Throughout this review: if you need to refer to other papers, add them to the bibliography, and cite them, e.g. [1, 3].
- State *how* the paper accomplishes its contribution. What is the main technical idea?

The point of Section 1 is to demonstrate that you have a decent understanding of the paper. Avoid evaluations.

2 Overall Evaluation

Comment on:

- importance, interest level for the scientific reader familiar with the area, novelty, correctness.
- related work: do the authors cite it, and do they differentiate themselves from it?
- experiments, if any: are they convincing? are they appropriately discussed (including weaknesses)?
- presentation: is it well written? are figures readable?

3 Summarize Pros (+) and Cons (−)

+ ...

− ...

4 Minor Comments; Typos

Reviews often contain a few remarks on typos that will not be caught by a spell-checker (“Since x is greater than y , ...”), or technical errors that look like they *might* be easy to fix (“Since $a, b \geq 0$, we know that $a + b$ is a positive number.”) This is mostly to assist the authors to improve the writing. **Only list very few such instance, if any.** Do not attempt to act as a complete human spell-checker—this is not the job of a paper summary or a review.

5 Technical Comments; Questions

If there is any technical aspect that you found odd or didn't understand, describe it here. Be detailed; ask questions. Why? (i) to suggest to the authors to present this more clearly, and (ii) because many conferences and most journals give authors the opportunity to respond to such questions before the fate of the paper is decided.

References

- [1] C. A. R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Commun. ACM*, 12(10):576–580, 1969.
- [2] C. A. R. Hoare. Proof of a program: FIND. *Commun. ACM*, 14(1):39–45, 1971.
- [3] A. Pnueli. The temporal logic of programs. In *18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Providence, Rhode Island, USA, 31 October - 1 November 1977*, pages 46–57. IEEE Computer Society, 1977.