

Topic of the Paper

Briefly describe the contents of the paper you are given to review. Use *your own words* to summarise the paper.

Form

- **Cover Page** : Contains the cover page all relevant information? (Name of the author and matriculation number, topic, name of the seminar, semester, name of the docent, course of study of the author)?
- **Table of Contents** : Is there a Table of Contents with page numbers? Is it structured correctly? Are there any sections without siblings?
- **Appearances of the Text** : Is the layout of the text done in a way s.t. it is clearly, consistently, and easily readably? (sufficient page margins, line spacing, structuring using headings and paragraphs, not too many or too short paragraphs)?
- **Language** : Is the language appropriate for scientific writing (colloquial terms, contractions)? Are there spelling or grammar mistakes?
- **Citing and References** : Is the work of others correctly, completely, and consistently cited? Are direct quotes correctly marked?
- **Tables and Figures** : Are tables and figures easily readable (size, colours)? To tables and figures have a key (legend)? Does it explain everything that is in the figure? Are tables and figures numbered? To they have a citation if necessary? Does the text of the paper refer to the tables and figures?
- **Bibliography** : Is the bibliography complete and correct?
- **Length** : Is the length of the paper as required?

Content : Introduction

- **Motivation / Relevance of the Topic** : Does the author motivate why the topic of the paper is interesting? Is the (practical) relevance of the topic motivated? Are there examples if appropriate?
- **Question** : Does the introduction pose a scientific question that can be investigated and answered?
- **Overview** : Does the introduction provide an overview of the rest of the paper?

Content : Main Part

- **Structure** : Is the paper structured in a systematic way? Are the explanations given in the paper directed at answering the question posed in the introduction? Or are they irrelevant?
- **State of the Art** : Is the current state of the art correctly and coherently explained? Is this explanation focussed on the topic of the paper?
- **Breadth vs Depth** : Is the work set into relation with other relevant research? Is the level of detail consistent over all explanations / all topics discussed? Are there any discussions not relevant for the topic of the paper?
- **Rigour of Thought / Logic** : Is any argumentation coherent? Does its structure sensible? Are arguments supported by citations or facts (if necessary)? Is there a guiding thread of thought in the argumentation? Have results been derived in a reasonable and logically sound way?
- **Originality** : Does the paper show that the author has considered the topic by himself or is the paper merely a reproduction of the work of others? Contains the paper a novel critical point-of-view on the work? Does the paper expose connections or differences between multiple lines of work? Does the author provide his own evaluation or solution?

Content : Conclusion

- **Summary** : Are the question posed in the beginning and the results derived in the paper summarised? Does the summary contain the central arguments or characteristics?
- **Discussion of the Results** : Is the relevance of the results discussed?
- **Discussion of Possible Consequences** : Are possible consequences of the results discussed? Is there a discussion practical issues (implementation/application to practical problems)?

Conclusion

Provide a *short* summary and conclusion of your review.