Checkpoint 3 – Draft paper reviews

The goal of this checkpoint is for you to dive deeply into understanding your three selected papers. You will be required to thoroughly read and understand 3 (though you could do more) research paper satisfying the standard paper requirements (e.g., 2018-2020, ICML, NeurIPS, etc. see course project description). If you want to do a research paper outside of these standard requirements, you must email the instructor and receive explicit approval over email before the due date.

This selection of papers could be the papers you used before or could be different papers if you've decided to pursue a different direction.

You should submit a PDF for peer review to Circuit that follows the ICML 2020 LaTeX guidelines. The structure should be very clear and similar to the example from checkpoint 1 on the course website. For example, you should use section headings to signify the required elements below. overleaf.com is recommended for LaTeX compilation. The required elements of this checkpoint are:

1. **[All 3 papers] Summary of each paper** – You should summarize your paper **in your own words**. Note plagiarizing the abstract or sentences from the paper will not be accepted as per the syllabus. If you understand the paper well enough, you should be able to summarize the main points in your own words. If you have any questions about plagiarism, please feel to ask anonymously on Piazza or email me If you ever use any quotes from the paper you must surround the sentence in quotes and place a proper citation. You should include citations to each paper in this section when you discuss them.

2. **[All 3 papers] Critical review of each paper** – You should provide a critical review of each paper. This should review the strengths and weaknesses of the paper as well as any questions you would want to ask the authors. You could also discuss anything else about the paper including other related works that were not cited or how it relates to the other papers you selected (e.g., in what contexts it might be better and what context it might be worse than other work). Overall, the goal of this part is to demonstrate that you understand the paper deeply rather than just superficially.

3. **References (at least 3)** - Reference list for all (at least 3) papers similar to the first checkpoint. If your paper does not satisfy the standard requirements, you must state when you received approval in your submitted PDF (see checkpoint 1 example). *Make sure to include all the necessary elements of the citation (see course project description).*

4. **Page requirement –** For this checkpoint, I am requiring a length (excluding references) of **greater than 2 pages** (note that this means your written content must spill over onto the third page). This forces you to write more in depth. Also, writing is a very important skill for research to communicate your research and can demonstrate clear thinking (or lack thereof). If you cannot write about something, you may not really understand it.

The basic rubric for peer review is given below.

1. [Paper 1] Does the submission contain a summary in their own words?

0 points	5 points	10 points
Did not include a summary.	Summary is only 3 sentences or less.	Summary is one paragraph or more.

2. [Paper 1] Does the submission contain a critical review?

0 points	5 points	10 points
Did not include review.	Review is only 3 sentences or less.	Review is one paragraph or more.

3. [Paper 2] Does the submission contain a summary in their own words?

0 points	5 points	10 points
Did not include a summary.	Summary is only 3 sentences or less.	Summary is one paragraph or more.

4. [Paper 2] Does the submission contain a critical review?

0 points	5 points	10 points
Did not include review.	Review is only 3 sentences or less.	Review is one paragraph or more.

5. [Paper 3] Does the submission contain a summary in their own words?

0 points	5 points	10 points
Did not include summary.	Summary is only 3 sentences or less.	Summary is one paragraph or more.

6. [Paper 3] Does the submission contain a critical review?

0 points	5 points	10 points
Did not include review.	Review is only 3 sentences or less.	Review is one paragraph or more.

7. Did the submission contain 3 appropriate references?

0 points	3 points	5 points	8 points	10 points
Did not include references.	Missing two references.	Missing one reference.	Missing PDF url, title, authors, venue, and/or year in one or more references.	Included all references with all required elements.

8. Does the submission meet the page requirements (EXCLUDING references)?

0 points	5 points	15 points	25 points
Written content is less than half a page.	Written content (excluding references) is one page or less (i.e., does not spill onto second page).	Written content (excluding references) is at least 1 page (i.e., spills onto the 2nd page).	Written content (excluding references) is at least 2 pages (i.e., spills onto the 3rd page).

9. How would you rank the quality of this submission relative to other submissions in the class?

1 point	3 points	5 points
Below average (lower 25%)	Average (25%-75%)	Above average (75%-100%)