

# Review form<sup>12</sup>

---

## ProSeminar: Compilerbau (SoSe2018)

Stefan Kögel, Michael Stegmaier, Raffaella Groner

Institute of Software Engineering and Programming Languages, Ulm University

### Basic Information

Name of reviewer: [TODO]

Title of the reviewed article: [TODO]

Name of the reviewed article's author: [TODO]

Date: [TODO]

### Summary

[TODO: Summarize the article in four to five sentences]

### Classification

Please judge the paper using the following evaluation levels. Enter the results in the table. The levels represent typical judgements of an international conference. 1 = strong accept and I would argue for it; 2 = weak accept; 3 = weak reject; 4 = strong reject and I would argue for it.

In order to come to a unified judgement, we provide a set of guiding questions, which you should consider when evaluating the paper. Additionally, consider the seminar guidelines presented to you in the beginning. Justify your judgements using the provided text areas.

Criteria	Evaluation (number 1-4)
<b>Abstract</b> Is the abstract's wording suited? Does it use the right abstraction level? Does the abstract clearly illustrate what the reader can expect from the article? Is the abstract self-contained (i.e. understandable without considering the remainder of the article)?	[TODO]

---

<sup>1</sup>Please complete all fields marked with „[TODO]“.

<sup>2</sup>Template by Jun.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. Steffen Becker, Universität Paderborn

Criteria	Evaluation (number 1-4)
<b>Formal Aspects</b> Is the document's length and formatting according to the provided guidelines? Is the spelling and grammar appropriate?	[TODO]
<b>Outline</b> Is the presented work well motivated? Does the introduction explain the paper's structure? Are the section title's on the right abstraction level and do they use appropriate wording? Are all terms explained before their use? Are the headings consistent with their section's contents?	[TODO]
<b>Style and Readability</b> Does the article efficiently use technical terms, formulas, pseudo-code, figures, or tables without being too narrative, not scientific or exaggerated scientific? Is the line of argumentation clear and understandable? Is there no pseudo-scientific style used in the thesis? Are the sentences and sections of appropriate length?	[TODO]
<b>Use of References</b> Are all necessary references given at the right places? Are all references relevant for the article's topic? Are all literal citations marked as such?	[TODO]
<b>Bibliography</b> Are all entries in the bibliography complete and correct? Are all critical statements backed up by references?	[TODO]
<b>Level of Detail</b> Is the presentation of the technical concepts appropriate for target readers? Are the explanations comprehensible? Is there a good balance between low-level technical details and high-level concepts? (Reminder: Most topics requested a survey or summary of a certain topic or area) Is the level of detail suited for an article of the given length?	[TODO]
<b>Completeness</b> Is the text complete?	[TODO]
<b>Conclusions</b> Is there an appropriate summary of the article's contents? Is there a critical, subjective reflection of the article's contents?	[TODO]
<b>Overall Impression</b>	[TODO]

## Explanations

Thoroughly **justify your judgements** in this section (both: positive and negative aspects). Provide constructive feedback on how to improve the article.

**Language use and style:** [TODO]

**Bibliography (missing or superfluous references):** [TODO]

**Level of Detail:** [TODO]

**Strong aspects of the article:** [TODO]

**Weak aspects of the article:** [TODO]

### **Miscellaneous**

Comments not fitting into any other category.

**Comments:** [TODO]