



Introduction to Scientific Working

Cezary Kaliszyk

Summary of last lecture

- Positions and Titles
- Work of an Academic
- Evaluations
- Academic Systems in the World

Publication Process

- 1 Call for Papers **FIND!**
- 2 Submission (extensions)
- 3 Refereeing, Peer-Review: Accept (with changes) or Reject by PC or Editorial Board
- 4 Revision
- 5 Final Version, Copyright Transfer
- 6 Handouts, Proceedings, Journal versions

Conferences

- 7 Preparation of a presentation
- 8 Conference visit with the talk

EasyChair, ConfTool, Cocon

Definition (Peer-Review)

Works are reviewed anonymously by scientists (peers)

Example (Example Review)

```
-----  
*** REVIEW FORM ID: 915461::436352  
*** SUBMISSION NUMBER: 29  
*** TITLE: <Titel>  
*** AUTHORS: <Author>  
*** PC MEMBER:  
-----
```

Definition (Review)

A **description** of an already published work

Kinds of publications

Fast publication of partial results

1 technical report

- usually electronic
- no review process

2 entry in proceedings

- still quite fast
- page limit, usually 5–15
- smaller projects
- review process
- acceptance rate varies, 20% for top conferences
- most common publication medium in computer science

Complete descriptions of topics

3 journals

- completed research works
- no (hard) page limit
- proper review process
- journal quality evaluated based on citations (e.g., Impact Factor or Science Citation Index from Thomson Scientific)

4 book chapter

- comparable to journals and conference proceedings
- often more limited topic selection

5 book

6 Bachelor, Master, PhD, Habilitation -thesis

- Extensive work for a particular academic degree
- Exam committee performs the peer review

Peer-Review

- technical content
- presentation
- suited for conference
- readability for wider audience
- correctness of proofs
- relevance
- is it well motivated
- originality

Referees

- (almost) everyone also writes reviews
- reviewers are selected by PC members

Process

- Editors search for competent reviewers for an article
- Reviewers suggest acceptance or rejection
- The editor makes the final choice

How does a review look like

- 1 Summary of an article
- 2 Evaluation
- 3 Recommendation

Review Form

*** REVIEW FORM ID:
*** SUBMISSION NUMBER:
*** TITLE:
*** AUTHORS:
*** PC MEMBER: Cezary Kaliszyk

*** REVIEW:

*** REMARKS FOR THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE:
--- If you wish to add any remarks for PC members, please write
--- them below. These remarks will only be used during the PC
--- meeting. They will not be sent to the authors. This field is
--- optional.

--- If the review was written by (or with the help from) a
--- subreviewer different from the PC member in charge, add
--- information about the subreviewer in the form below. Do not
--- modify the lines beginning with ***

*** REVIEWER'S FIRST NAME: (write in the next line)

*** REVIEWER'S LAST NAME: (write in the next line)

*** REVIEWER'S EMAIL ADDRESS: (write in the next line)

Review Form (cont'd)

--- In the evaluations below, uncomment the line with your
--- evaluation or confidence. You can also remove the
--- irrelevant lines

*** OVERALL EVALUATION:

*** 3 strong accept
*** 2 accept
*** 1 weak accept
*** 0 borderline paper
*** -1 weak reject
*** -2 reject
*** -3 strong reject

*** REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE:

*** 5 (expert)
*** 4 (high)
*** 3 (medium)
*** 2 (low)
*** 1 (none)

*** END

Mini-Seminarwork

Send me the:

- Paper: pdf
- Complete sources: tex, bib, sty?

All will be put online.

- If your work is number n , the ones to review are $n + 1$, $n + 2$, and $n + 3$ (mod number of works)