Some Important Point on Paper Review

The papers covered are picked from top conferences and journals. They were accepted because they proposed some new idea that the reviewers liked. What's the problem addressed in the paper and why is it important? If the paper is a research paper, what are their main contributions? Does their proposed contribution have limitations? Are the assumptions made by the authors reasonable, is the methodology OK? What are the design tradeoffs? If their idea was proposed on a small scale, would it scale to a large system easily? Is there work that you know of that does the same thing and is not referenced? If it is a survey section, is it complete, well organized. Would future work reference this work a lot either for this contribution, completeness or clarity?

How well did the writers back their claims up with numbers? Did they give any evidence? You should mention the main numbers that support the claims.

A good referee does not just hammer papers. A good referee can actually make nice suggestions to improve the paper. If you were a referee for this paper, what did you not like about this paper? What did you like about this paper? Do you have any suggestions on what they could do to improve the paper?

Are there interesting ways you thought to extend their work? Note that even if you describe ideas about extending this paper, you won’t be forced to do them. You can just talk about your ideas.