Paper evaluation form

for the paper

Yao, Yanjun “A survey of Belief revision on Reputation management”

<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>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language used in the paper is correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper is logical and well structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general typeset of the paper is correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper was interesting to read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper gives a good overview of the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material in the paper is mathematically correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to the external sources are presented correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the relevant references are present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The formulae are typed correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer the following questions in free text.

1. How to evaluate the selection of the topic?

I think it is a good topic to be concerned. Belief revision is one of very important issues in reputation management and reputation management is one of hot topic recently. If the author wants to develop it to a master thesis, then it could be a good one.

2. How to evaluate general presentation style?

The presentation style is clear. I got the overall structure of the paper very quickly. Sub sections belong to a section are also relevant. I also think the way the author gave examples is very good, that helps to understand the paper.

The paper has a good structure.

3. How to evaluate the selection of the information given in the paper?
and why it concerns. After that she explained two sets of algorithms and gave examples. Everything is relevant and easy to understand.

4. How to evaluate typesetting of the paper?

I do not think there are really many typesetting errors. However, I would like to see better pictures, at least one I can not read the picture well

Sometimes bullet forms are not used correctly

5. What was new and interesting to me in the paper?

Because my topic is about unfair ratings in reputation management, I found this paper interesting. It made me understand more how to model the way users change their belief. It somehow complements my knowledge I gained from my topic.

One more interesting point is although there are some proposed algorithms already, on practical implementation uses them, ☹

6. What else would I have liked to read?

I want read about a more overview on the issue, although the paper already shown a number of algorithms. For example, what researchers are doing on this topic, how algorithms are divided into groups (because it is a survey), why no practical implementation, and so on

Please refer to specific shortcomings.

1. The paper has the following misprints:

   Perhaps NO.

2. The paper has the following mistakes in wording and style:

   That is just a suggestion: maybe you use only one form: bullet form or number form. For example: in the middle and the bottom of the column 2, page 2.

   Bullets are not presented correctly: end of the page 3

   Figure 3 is not clear

3. The paper has the following mathematical mistakes:

   I just wonder, in the example 4.3.2, how do we get the reputation of Alice and Bob. The reputation must be somehow related to other information we use.
The value 0.738 in the example 4.1.2 is from where?

4. The paper has the following mistakes in typesetting

   No (Maybe I explain it already in the question 2)

5. The paper will be more readable if the author makes the following changes:

   Use better figures.

6. The paper misses the following elements (topics, references, figures, proof steps, etc.)

   Do not see any

7. The following elements could be removed from the paper

   Sometimes, when you refer something, I think you just write its number. For example, instead of “see [1]”, just write [1]. (in the end of column 1, page 1)

8. Other comments:

   Maybe you can check for grammar errors more. It does not prevent me for understanding your paper, but it may make the paper better. For example, caption of the figure 1, I think it should be “rationality”, because “rational” is an adjective.

   However, I really like your examples, 😊