

Paper evaluation form

Title: A survey of unfair rating problem and detection methods in reputation management systems

Author: Long Ngo, Tartu University, Ingo@cc.hut.fi

Evaluation criterion	No	Rather no than yes	More or less	Rather yes than no	Yes
The paper is well readable					+
Language used in the paper is correct				+	
The paper is logical and well structured					+
The general typeset of the paper is correct					+
The paper was interesting to read					+
The paper gives a good overview of the topic					+
The material in the paper is mathematically correct					+
References to the external sources are presented correctly					+
All the relevant references are present					+
The formulae are typed correctly					+

Answer the following questions in free text.

- How to evaluate the selection of the topic?
Topic is quite interesting and actual for all of internet communities and social networks. As those communities and networks grow quickly, this topic is interesting to study.
- How to evaluate general presentation style?
Very good.
- How to evaluate the selection of the information given in the paper?
It seems to me that author of this paper worked through quite a lot of material (as number of entries in used bibliography is quite long). Author made her own conclusions and remarks (this is good) and did not fully rewrite explanations from sources.
- How to evaluate typesetting of the paper?
It is OK.
- What was new and interesting to me in the paper?
Everything. I have thought a lot about rating systems but I have never searched for scientific solutions and researches about RMS's.
- What else would I have liked to read?
Actually: nothing. This amount of the paper described RMS's in enough deepness.

Please refer to specific shortcomings.

- The paper has the following misprints:
Not sure but page 3 "q=0.0.1" should be "q=0.001"
page 4, section 3.1.3, "global match (GC)" should be "global confidence"?

- There are also some typos, I won't extract them as this paper is in draft status anyway.
2. The paper has the following mistakes in wording and style:
number of pages might be helpful when referencing to mistakes.
 3. The paper has the following mathematical mistakes:
 4. The paper has the following mistakes in typesetting:
 5. The paper will be more readable if the author makes the following changes:
 6. The paper misses the following elements (topics, references, figures, proof steps, etc.):
 7. The following elements could be removed from the paper:
 8. Other comments: