

Mini-Paper 1 Reviews:

Name: Don't forget to add your name

Collaborators:

You will be assigned as a reviewer of other teams submissions on HotCRP. For each paper which you are a reviewer, you should run their code and write a two-paragraph review of the paper.

This review is designed to help prepare you for submitting conference papers, and is aimed at emulating that experience (though combining artifact evaluation and review).

1 Paper Review

The first paragraph should be similar to a traditional conference paper review. Your review should start with a short (one or two sentence) summary of the paper – its motivation/problem, and solutions provided. You should make a few high-level remarks regarding the pros and cons of the approach (was a contribution particularly interesting/novel, was there something additional that could have been done which would strengthen the paper). Stay positive in your review when giving constructive criticism – these are your fellow classmates. Most importantly, provide suggestions on not only the technical content of the paper, but also its presentation. Was there something particularly effective about how they described their work, or perhaps do you have an idea for how something could be presented differently that would improve comprehension?

2 Artifact Evaluation

The second paragraph of the review should be similar to a traditional paper artifact evaluation. You should run the submitted artifact. For each of the claims in the paper, describe whether you can validate the claims made. This does not require reproducing the exact speedups, but whether the overall trends found are true. Similarly, if you have suggestions for how to improve the presentation for a future artifact reviewer, please say so.

3 How to Submit?

Please submit your review to the papers assigned to you in HotCRP by directly adding your review in HotCRP.