

Научни радови - рецензирање -

Горан Ненадић
School of Computer Science, University of Manchester
Математички институт, Београд

1

Рецензирање научних радова

2

Поступак рецензије рада

- Аутори шаљу рад часопису или конференцији
- Одређује се 2-5 рецензента који рецензирају рад, напишу одвојене извештаје који се шаљу ауторима уз одлуку, нпр.
 - ☐ прихватити без измена
 - ☐ прихватити уз мање измене, као што је наведено
 - ☐ нужне су значајне измене рада
 - ☐ рад није прихватљив (одбијен)
- Одлуку доноси уредник часописа или председавајући конференције

3

Поступак рецензије рада

- Ако рад није неприхватљив, од аутора се захтева да га прераде у складу са захтевима рецензената и поново га пошаљу
 - ☐ за часописе се захтева да се таксативно наброје измене и то по сваком питању које су рецензенти поставили
 - ☐ рад се поново шаље на рецензију
- Цео процес може да траје месецима
- Кад се рад прихвати, онда се форматира у складу са форматом издавача часописа
 - ☐ аутори сами форматирају рад за конференције

4

Прихваћени рад

- Чува се у бази радова издавача
 - ☐ електронска верзија, а све ређе штампани облик
- Постоје специјализоване колекције које
 - ☐ сакупљају библиографске податке од разних издавача
 - ☐ додају се додатни мета-подаци
 - ☐ повезивање на цео текст рада код издавача

5

Модел приступа радовима

- Претплата на часописе, зборнике
 - ☐ читаоци плаћају приступ
- Отворен приступ
 - ☐ аутори плаћају за објављивање

6

Колекције значајне за информатику

Citeseer	Digital library of 750k freely available papers in computer and information science http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu
Google	General internet search engine http://www.google.co.uk
Google Scholar	Searches scholarly literature on the web. http://scholar.google.com
Scirus	Searches journals (ScienceDirect) and web resources http://www.scirus.com/
Windows Live Search Academic	Academic search engine - search academic journals and content for article titles, author names, article abstracts, and conference proceedings. http://academic.live.com/

7

Колекције значајне за информатику

наставак

- ACM Digital Library: ACM journals and conference proceedings
<http://portal.acm.org>
- IEEE Xplore: IEEE journals, conference proceedings, and books
<http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>
- SpringerLink: Springer journals, conference proceedings, and books
<http://www.springerlink>

8

Рецензирање радова

- Рецензирање
 - ☐ оцена од стране колега из дате области (peer review)
 - ☐ процес критичког испитивања научних резултата, идеја и реализације од стране оних који су експерти у истој или сличној области.
 - ☐ за сваку област је неопходно имати "истраживачку заједницу" - скуп експерата који имају искуство и квалификовани су да одраде независну и објективну рецензију.
 - ☐ не гарантује да неће бити грешака у радовима

9

Peer review

- **Peer review** (also known as **refereeing**) is the process of subjecting an author's scholarly work, research, or ideas to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field. Peer review requires a community of experts in a given (and often narrowly defined) field, who are qualified and able to perform impartial review. Impartial review, especially of work in less narrowly defined or interdisciplinary fields, may be difficult to accomplish; and the significance (good or bad) of an idea may never be widely appreciated among its contemporaries.
- Although generally considered essential to academic quality, and used in most important scientific publications, peer review has been criticized as ineffective, slow, and misunderstood (see anonymous peer review and open peer review).

10

Оцењивање радова

- Рецензирање је очигледно социјална активност
 - ☐ у мањим заједницама, често рецензирају радове својих познаника
 - ☐ вишеструке рецензије (2-5 рецензената)
- Типови рецензија
 - ☐ Анонимне - идентитет рецензента није познат ауторима
 - ☐ Дупло-скривене - идентитет аутора није познат рецензентима, а ни обрнуто
 - ☐ Отворене рецензије - сви идентитети су познати

11

Оцењивање радова - питања

- What is the main topic of the article?
- Is the topic of the paper sufficiently interesting (for you personally or in general)?
- What was/were the main issue(s) the author said they want to discuss?
- Why did the author claim it was important?
- How does the work build on other's work, in the author's opinion?
 - ☐ Did the author miss important earlier work?

12

Оцењивање радова - питања

- Are the evaluation methods adequate?
- Are the theorems and proofs correct?
- What simplifying assumptions does the author claim to be making?
- Are arguments convincing?
- Does the author mention directions for future research that interest you?

13

Пример - рецензије за једну конференцију

14

Рецензирање за конференције

- Разне врсте конференција
 - ☐ врло јаке конференције (нпр. годишњи састанци професионалних удружења)
 - прихвата се 10-20% пријављених радова
 - одговара раду у часопису
 - ☐ добре конференције
 - ☐ скимпозијуми
 - ☐ профитаонице

15

Пример - добра конференција

- APPROPRIATENESS
- ORIGINALITY/INNOVATIVENESS
- SOUNDNESS/CORRECTNESS
- MEANINGFUL COMPARISON
- SUBSTANCE
- IMPACT OF IDEAS OR RESULTS
- REPLICABILITY
- IMPACT OF RESOURCES
- CLARITY
- RECOMMENDATION
- REVIEWER CONFIDENCE

16

Пример - APPROPRIATENESS

Does the paper fit in ACL 2010? Please answer this question in light of the desire to broaden the scope of the research areas represented at ACL.

- 5: Certainly.
 4: Probably.
 3: Unsure.
 2: Probably not.
 1: Certainly not.

17

Пример - ORIGINALITY

Does this paper break new ground in topic, methodology, or content? How exciting and innovative is the research it describes?

- 5 = Seminal: Significant new analysis or insight -- no prior research has attempted something similar.
 4 = Creative: An intriguing analysis that is substantially different from previous research.
 3 = Respectable: A nice research contribution that represents a significant extension of prior analyses or approaches.
 2 = Pedestrian: Obvious, or a minor extension to existing work.
 1 = Significant portions have actually been done before or done better.

18

Пример - CORRECTNESS

First, is the analysis sound and the method of analysis well-chosen? Second, can one trust the claims of the paper -- are they supported by the analysis and are the results correctly interpreted?

- 5 = The analysis is very apt, and the claims are convincingly supported.
- 4 = Generally solid work, although there are some aspects of the analysis that I am not sure about.
- 3 = Fairly reasonable work. The analysis is not bad, and at least the main claims are probably correct, but I am not entirely ready to accept them (based on the material in the paper).
- 2 = Troublesome. There are some ideas worth salvaging here, but the analysis should really have been done differently.
- 1 = Fatally flawed.

19

Пример - COMPARISON

Does the author make clear where the analysis sits with respect to existing literature? Are the references adequate?

- 5 = Precise and complete comparison with related work. Good job given the space constraints.
- 4 = Mostly solid bibliography and comparison, but there are some references missing.
- 3 = Bibliography and comparison are somewhat helpful, but it could be hard for a reader to determine exactly how this work relates to previous work.
- 2 = Only partial awareness and understanding of related work, or a flawed comparison.
- 1 = Little awareness of related work, or lacks necessary comparison.

20

Пример - SUBSTANCE

Does this paper have enough substance, or would it benefit from further work? Note that this question mainly concerns the amount of work; its quality is evaluated in other categories.

- 5 = Contains more ideas and analysis than most publications in this conference; goes the extra mile.
- 4 = Represents an appropriate amount of work for a publication in this conference.
- 3 = Leaves open one or two natural questions that should have been pursued within the paper.
- 2 = Work in progress. There are some good ideas, but perhaps not enough substance in the paper yet.
- 1 = Seems thin. Not enough ideas here for a full-length paper.

21

Пример - IMPACT

How significant is the work described? If the ideas are novel, will they also be useful or inspirational? If the analysis is sound, is it also important? Does the paper bring new insights?

- 5 = Will affect the field by altering other people's choice of research topics or basic approach.
- 4 = Some of the ideas or analysis will substantially help other people's ongoing research.
- 3 = Interesting but not too influential. The work will be cited, but mainly for comparison or as a source of minor contributions.
- 2 = Marginally interesting. May or may not be cited.
- 1 = Will have no impact on the field.

22

Пример - REPLICABILITY

Will members of the ACL community be able to reproduce or verify the analysis presented in the paper? Members of the ACL community:

- 5 = could easily reproduce the analysis.
- 4 = could mostly reproduce the analysis, but there may be some variation because of minor variations in their interpretation of the protocol or method.
- 3 = could reproduce the analysis with some difficulty.
- 2 = would be hard pressed to reproduce the analysis. The contribution depends on data that are simply not available outside the author's institution or consortium; not enough details are provided.
- 1 = could not reproduce the analysis here no matter how hard they tried.

23

Пример - CLARITY

For the reasonably well-prepared reader, is it clear what analysis has been performed and why? Is the paper well-written and well-structured?

- 5 = Very clear.
- 4 = Understandable by most readers.
- 3 = Mostly understandable to me with some effort.
- 2 = Important questions were hard to resolve even with effort.
- 1 = Much of the paper is confusing.

24

Пример - RECOMMENDATION

There are many good submissions competing for slots at ACL 2010; how important is it to feature this one? Will people learn a lot by reading this paper or seeing it presented? In deciding on your ultimate recommendation, please think over all your scores above. But remember that no paper is perfect, and remember that we want a conference full of interesting, diverse, and timely work. If a paper has some weaknesses, but you really got a lot out of it, feel free to fight for it. If a paper is solid but you could live without it, let us know that you're ambivalent. Remember also that the author has a few weeks to address reviewer comments before the camera-ready deadline. Should the paper be accepted or rejected?

25

Пример - RECOMMENDATION

- 6 = Exciting: I'd fight to get it accepted; probably would be one of the best papers at the conference.
- 5 = Strong: I'd like to see it accepted; it will be one of the better papers at the conference.
- 4 = Worthy: A good paper that is worthy of being presented at ACL.
- 3 = Ambivalent: OK but does not seem up to the standards of ACL.
- 2 = Leaning against: I'd rather not see it in the conference.
- 1 = Poor: I'd fight to have it rejected.

26

REVIEWER CONFIDENCE (1-5)

- 5 = Positive that my evaluation is correct. I read the paper very carefully and am familiar with related work.
- 4 = Quite sure, I tried to check the important points carefully. It's unlikely, though conceivable, that I missed something that should affect my ratings.
- 3 = Pretty sure, but there's a chance I missed something. Although I have a good feel for this area in general, I did not carefully check the paper's details, e.g., the math, experimental design, or novelty.
- 2 = Willing to defend my evaluation, but it is fairly likely that I missed some details, didn't understand some central points, or can't be sure about the novelty of the work.
- 1 = Not my area, or paper is very hard to understand. My evaluation is just an educated guess.

27

Detailed Comments

- Please supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. These comments will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Moreover, if the paper is accepted, the comments should guide the authors in making revisions for a final manuscript. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors.

28

Confidential Comments for Committee

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may want to express a very strong (negative) opinion on the paper, which might offend the authors in some way. Or, perhaps you wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share comments of this nature with the committee, this is the place to put them.

29
