Social Network Analysis for Computer Scientists

Frank Takes

LIACS, Leiden University

https://liacs.leidenuniv.nl/~takesfw/SNACS

Week 10 — Peer review

In the next weeks . . .

- Write code
- Run experiments
- Evaluate results
- Write remaining sections of the paper
- Process feedback from today
- Nov 24: optional intermediary paper check deadline
- In two weeks: code review session
- In little over four weeks: hard project deadline
- Report any questions, issues, difficulties or problems
- Today: peer review

Peer review

- **Peer review**: evaluation of work by one or more individuals with similar competence
- Single blind: reviewer name unknown to authors
- Double blind: reviewer and author unknown to both
- As a scientist, on average, for each paper that you write, you need to do X reviews assuming that you want X reviews of your work
- For each existing paper, on average $X = 3$ reviews were written
- There are over 60 million peer reviewed papers, so easily 180 million reviews were written!

Peer review

Van: em.son.0.86579b.fec6ccfb@editorialmanager.com <em.son.0.86579b.fec6ccfb@editorialmanager.com> namens Social Networks <em@editorialmanager.com>
Verzonden: donderdag 28 september 2023 17:01
Aan: Takes, F.W. (Frank) <f.w.takes@liacs.leidenuniv.nl>
Onderwerp: Invitation to review for Social Networks

Manuscript Number: SON-D-23-00

Dear Dr. Takes,

I would like to invite you to review the above referenced manuscript, as I believe it falls within your expertise and interest. The abstract and the PDF for this manuscript is included below.
You should treat this invitation, the manuscript and your review (as well as other reviewer comments shared with you) as confidential. You must not share your review or information about the review process with anyone without the agreement of the editors and authors involved, irrespective of the publication outcome. If the manuscript is rejected by this journal and the author agrees that the submission be transferred to another Elsevier journal via the Article Transfer Service, we may securely transfer your reviewer comments and name/contact details to the receiving journal editor for their peer review purposes.
Please respond to this invitation at your earliest opportunity.

If you would like to review this paper, please click this link:
Agree to Review

If you have a conflict of interest or do not wish to review this paper, please click this link:
Decline to Review

If you decline to review, I would appreciate your suggestions for alternate reviewers.

If, for any reason, the above links do not work, please log in as a reviewer at https://www.editorialmanager.com/son/.

Since timely reviews are of utmost importance to authors, I would appreciate receiving your review within 28 days of accepting this invitation

Paper structure

1. Introduction
2. Problem Statement
3. Related Work
4. Algorithms/Methodology
5. Datasets
6. Experiments and Results
7. Conclusion and Future Work
8. References

Introduction

- Is the context clearly sketched?
- Is the problem well described?
- Why do we study this problem?
- What applications does it have?
- How is this paper going to contribute to previous work?
- Is the structure of the rest of the paper clearly described?

Problem statement

- Are definitions in words given?
- Are relevant formal definitions given? (if applicable)
- How difficult is this problem? (perhaps in terms of time and space complexity)
- Can you give best-case and worst-case examples?
- How can we verify that we have correctly solved the problem?

Algorithms/Methodology

- Are the algorithms well-explained?
- What type of algorithms are discussed (exact/approximate?)
- Are the algorithms time and memory efficient?
- What about scalability of the methods?
- Are any parameters involved? If so, how are they set or tuned?
- Is the technique domain-(in)dependent?

Data and Experiments

- Is the data relevant and sufficient?
- Is the data "diverse" in relevant dimensions?
- What do you measure in each experiment?
  quality, running time, error, correlation, . . . ?
- Why is this data good for these experiments?
- Are there any limitations to doing the experiments in this way?
- Is the data possibly biased and how may this affect the experimental results?

Conclusion and Abstract

- Give an informed answer to the problem statement, in words
- Provide some suggestions for future work, extending or broadening your current work.
- The abstract is important and should give a short recap of the entire paper, with particular focus on what problem is solved, how it is solved, and what the main results and implications of that result are

Other things

- Formula correctness
- Grammar, interpunction ., and spellling
- Figures, diagrams, axis descriptions, captions, etc.
- Complete and consistent references
- LaTeX

Please be constructive!

Today

1. Find the other team; seek help from assistants if needed
2. Go sit together in Snellius (412, 174, foobar, canteen, etc.)
3. Explain your work to the other team; discuss where needed
4. Mention what you have done, and not yet done
5. Read (take your time!); make some notes
6. ...
7. Give **specific feedback** to each other
8. Write a short half-page report about your feedback on the other team's paper
9. Hand it in via Brightspace at the end of the lecture

- Team pairing schedule: see course website