# Paper evaluation form

Evaluate the next claims on the five-point-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rather no than yes</th>
<th>More or less</th>
<th>Rather yes than no</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The paper is well readable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language used in the paper is correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper is logical and well structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general typeset of the paper is correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper was interesting to read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper gives a good overview of the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material in the paper is mathematically correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to the external sources are presented correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the relevant references are present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The formulae are typed correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer the following questions in free text.

1. How to evaluate the selection of the topic?

   This is a tough and challenge topic. The author has done a very job on the survey, he read a lot of papers and made summaries of several algorithms.

2. How to evaluate general presentation style?

   The author’s presentation is not good, sometimes the words fail to express the meaning. The misuses of prepositions are very common in this paper, some sentences look weird, some words are omitted improperly that makes the meaning unclear, and there are several grammar faults.

3. How to evaluate the selection of the information given in the paper?

   The author selected several methods and separate them into two categories. The introduction of each method is clear.
4. How to evaluate typesetting of the paper?
   In total, the typesetting is good. However, the first character of each word in title should be in capital.

5. What was new and interesting to me in the paper?
   The discussion section contains something new.

6. What else would I have liked to read?
   I want to read more about the practical implementations of deception detection.

Please refer to specific shortcomings.

1. The paper has the following misprints:
   In introduction section: line 4 “hot” should be “how”, paragraph 5 “ans” should be “and”

2. The paper has the following mistakes in wording and style:
   The author uses some weird expressions, such as in introduction section “Internet is everywhere today”, “This became a big question” and so on. It is not a problem to understand what the author is talking about, but the use of those expressions makes the paper unprofessional.

3. The paper has the following mathematical mistakes:
   No

4. The paper has the following mistakes in typesetting:
   No

5. The paper will be more readable if the author makes the following changes:
   It would be better that the author can use words with similar meaning in proper positions. Such as in introduction section “This became a big question…” it would be better to use “problem” here. “As a results,” should be “as a result”. And there are other similar problems, do please pay attention to them, or they would decrease your authority.

6. The paper misses the following elements (topics, references, figures, proof steps, etc.):
   No

7. The following elements could be removed from the paper:
   No

8. Other comments:
Please pay more attention on your sentences. You’ll get twice the result with half the effort if you express them properly.