TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAM

YOUR NAME _____

YOUR REVIEWER NO. ___

(Please use last 4 digits of your student ID, driver's license, social security number, or dollar bill in your pocket). **(DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON ANY OTHER PAGES; JUST PUT YOUR REVIEWER NUMBER ON THE OTHER PAGES).**

This take-home final consists of 4 individual paper review forms (2-sided) and 1 overall review form (1 page) is to be deposited in a sealed envelope on **Wednesday, December 10, 2003 at 3:15 PM** in my mailbox on the 2nd floor of the Medical School Office Building (corner of Welsh Road and Campus Drive). The mailboxes are just to the left of the receptionist's desk when you come into the Stanford Biomedical Informatics section on the 2nd floor. If you print this out, be sure to print out 4 copies of the 4 individual paper review forms (either as a 2-sided document or as 2 separate pages).

This take-home involves your reading and reviewing 4 papers written by other students in the course as their descriptions of their term projects. This peer review process resembles the process by which researchers from the academic, commercial, government, and R & D worlds are asked to evaluate papers submitted for publication in technical journals and books, for presentation and publication of papers at technical conferences, and for evaluating proposals for funding for many government, foundation, and corporate grants.

Different papers will, of course, have strengths and weakness in different areas. Some tackle harder problems (perhaps not as completely answering the more difficult question than other papers tackling easier problems). Some pages engage the reader better than others. Some papers are written better than others. Yet they must all be ranked. There is no one correct way to review papers. Different reviewers will reach different conclusions for different reasons.   The required process of ranking the four papers in linear (non-tied) order requires the application of judgment involving conflicting factors (supported, of course, by your specific reasons).

Start by reading the 4 papers in your batch. Your 4 papers were drawn at random. Don't be concerned whether your papers are all somewhat better or worse than what you think may be the average. For purposes of this take-home exam, your exam paper will be evaluated on the basis of what you had to work with.

Fall 2003 BMI 226 / CS 426 Notes   W-2

The **4 copies of the "Evaluation of Individual Paper" forms** attached hereto ask you to make comments on the strengths and weaknesses of each paper (viewed alone).   The first 5 questions raise specific questions about whether the paper satisfied certain overall standards.   The **6th question is the 2nd most important question on this take-home exam** and asks for your advice to the author on how to improve the paper. In this process (and most "peer review" processes), the author receives all of the comments (good, bad, and indifferent) written by all of the reviewers (who are usually anonymous to the author). Thus, your name should NOT appear on the individual sheets.

The **1 copy of the "Overall Ranking of 4 Papers" form** are also attached hereto. This form asks you to make an overall comparative (**non-tied**) ranking of the 4 papers and give specific comparative reasons for your ranking (i.e., #1 is better than #2 because ... and #2 is better than #3 because... and #3 is better than #4 because...). **This is the most important question on this take-home exam**

Keep in mind that you will be graded in terms of the quality of the **SPECIFIC REASONS** that **YOU** give for your comments on the individual papers and the reasons **YOU** give for your overall ranking of the papers. Thus, it does not matter whether your random batch happens to contain unusually good or bad papers.   Note that unexplained judgments, opinions, or conclusions, such as "good paper," are of little interest. For purposes of this examination, we are interested in your **specific** comments supported by your **specific** reasons – whether they are positive, negative, or (more likely) mixed. The **quality of your reasons** for your ranking of the papers and the quality of your comments on the individual papers are what matters – not the "intrinsic merit" of the particular papers. (The instructor will try to grade the projects based on their "intrinsic merit" — that's his job). Note that it is not necessary that your opinion match that of the instructor (although experience indicates student opinion usually closely parallels that of the instructor). This examination will be graded on the basis of the quality of your specific reasons for your specific comments.

This exam is totally individual (and is not to be done with any person with whom you may have done a joint project). The Stanford Honors Code applies to this exam.

Reviewer No. ___

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS PAGE

EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL PAPER:

This page refers to paper written by _____.

1. WRITING QUALITY: How good is the organization, mechanical construction, sentence structure, spelling, and, above all, clarity of this paper?

2. IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM: Does this paper clearly identify the problem to be solved or the issue to be resolved?

3. COHERENCE / ACHIEVEMENT OF STATED OBJECTIVE OR ASSERTED CONCLUSION: Does the paper do what it claims it does (in the title, abstract, and introduction)? Does this paper actually provide an answer (or partial answer) to the issue raised? Or did it, in fact, do something entirely different from what the author claims?

4. THE TABLEAU: Every paper is supposed to have a tableau summarizing the details of at least one set-up of a run of the genetic algorithm. Is the tableau complete and accurate? This question relates somewhat to the next one.

5. REPLICABILITY: If an experiment is involved (as will be the case with most papers here), is there sufficient information in this paper to permit replication of the experiment? Why? If not, what is missing?

6. <u>SUGGESTIONS TO AUTHOR</u>: What suggestions would be make to the author to improve this paper? (NOTE: This question is almost always part of evaluations – whether the paper is headed for acceptance or rejection). **<u>This is the 2nd MOST important question in this take-home exam</u>**.

Reviewer No. ___

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS PAGE

OVERALL RANKING OF 4 PAPERS:

My ranking of the 4 papers (identified by author):

Best paper _____

2nd best paper _____

3rd best paper_____

Worst paper_____

REASONS FOR MY RANKING OF THE 4 PAPERS: This is the MOST important question in this take-home exam.