



METR7202 – Paper Review Instructions/Tips (As Slides)

METR 4202: **Robotics & Automation**

metr4202-staff@itee.uq.edu.au
<http://robotics.itee.uq.edu.au/~metr4202/>

© 2015 School of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering at the University of Queensland



Paper Review Description

- **Task Description:**
An extensive review and analysis of a recent (published after 2008), high-quality (A*) journal paper (e.g., an IEEE Transactions) related to **Robotics** or **Advanced Controls** or its application. This review should be at least **2 pages long** and should be presented in [IEEE Transactions Format](#) (10-point, double-column) and should reflect on the novelty of the work.
- **Submission:**
 - Electronic: via [Platypus²](#) Please
- **Due Date:**
Thursday, November 14, 2019 by 23:59 [**strict deadline**]



Format & Page Count

- The IEEE format is basically:
 - 2-Column
 - 10-point *Times* or *Times New Roman* font
 - Single line spacing
- A template is available [from the IEEE](#) for:
 - [Word](#) or
 - [LaTeX: Document Template](#) + [Bibliography Template](#)
- Page Count
 - It should be at least 2 pages long.



★ ★ Things to Consider ★ ★

- Abstract (short is sweet!)
 - What is the Problem, gap, approach, key results?
- Introduction
 - What is the “scientific gap” (what technical aspects have not yet been solved)?
- Related Work
 - How does prior work relates to this?
- Approach
 - What is the approach?
 - What is the innovation?
- Results
 - What are key results?
 - Main questions that are being investigated in experiment(s)?
 - How is it tested? Data sets, simulator, implementation details
 - What is the validation? Simulation of known results? Empirically?
- Summary/Discussions/Conclusion
 - Is the problem discuss with respect to open questions?
 - What are some new promising research directions from this?
- References



On the Introduction/Related Work

Consider:

- Does this paper motivate its problem
 - Why does it matter?
 - Why is it not solved yet?
 - What impact would a solution have?
 - What contribution did you make?



On the Approach/Results

- It doesn't matter how paper got there...
 - “We tried A, it didn't work, therefore we tried B” ☹
 - “B works. To see, let us consider an obvious alternative A, and show A does not work” ☺
- Does it document progress, not just achievement
 - “B works” ☹
 - “B improves over A (current techniques) by X, which is important because of ...” ☺



Reviewer Background Expertise

Reviewers may not be familiar with your area:

- Problem motivation
- State of the art
- Background material
- Notation
- Measures for evaluation
- Significant application domains

