



Wisdom from tea dipper handle

Before sending it off for review

- Be generous in attributing the work of others
 - The reviewer is likely someone who
 - you cited
 - should have cited
 - their friends
 - someone who cares about history
- Polish helps
- KISS (Keep it Simple Stupid)
 - Lead the reader where you want them to go

Dealing with the review

- The reviewer is (almost) always right!
 - If they are wrong, likely you were not clear enough to the right audience
- You must learn from what they say
 - Only you have something to gain
- Old saying to keep in mind
 - Wise men learn more from fools than fools from the wise. -- Cato the Elder
- And most important
 - Get a thick skin!

Reviewing generalities

- Be polite.
 - Don't write what you would regret if the author found out who you were!
- Begin with a short paragraph demonstrating that you read the paper
- Often this is followed by strengths and weaknesses
- This is often followed by substantive comments to support your decision
- This is then followed by minor comments / suggestions
- Conference reviewing often have forms that guide you through the above
- Be skeptical
 - A good writer will lead you down a path (so be a skeptic).
 - Check for prior work (Google makes this easy)
 - For experiments, ask yourself what does this really show.
 - Who cares anyway?
 - Will this have any impact (intellectual or broad)

Editorial Suggestions

(for reviewing your colleague's work)

- What to look for in the prose
 - plagiarism ?
 - order!
 - source?
 - vague or too abstract (very common error)
 - waffle
 - unclear
 - boring / content free
 - off topic
 - is the section on X about X?
 - is the paragraph supporting the argument it is starting with
 - // (new para)

English is hard!

Text I corrected in a paper I just reviewed.
Can you explain denote vs denotes here ?

Let X denote A . Y denotes B .