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Review content

► Is it interesting/important?
► Is it correct?
► Is it understandable?
► How could it be improved?
  – necessary vs recommended changes
Mechanics

- Comments to the authors
  - No mention of recommendation
  - Paragraph describing the work
  - Paragraph summarizing review
  - Separate major and minor points
  - Don’t leave anything out
  - Point to specific examples from the text
  - Authors do things differently than you; does it matter?
  - Use the “sandwich” method for constructive criticism

- Comments to the editor
  - Recommendation: accept, minor revisions, major revisions, reject
  - Summary of criticism, but no need to repeat
  - (vent a bit?)
Questions

▶ Why review papers?
▶ Who is the reviewer working for?
▶ Should reviews be open?
▶ Should reviews be non-anonymous?