

Brandon Ables

810 Fall 2024

Assignment 1

- What did you already know about paper reviewing?

I did not know much about paper reviewing prior to this paper. I had heard about getting comments back from reviewers on papers colleagues have submitted, but I haven't applied to enough conferences/journals yet to get reviewer comments. I did get comments from 5 reviewers from my Siggraph submission, 4 were positive and one was negative not seeing the point of what I was doing with my chin interfaces. I imagine it is a hard thing to do where the reviewer must be honest about their specialty so they can provide the right feedback to authors in that area. I was also aware of ethical considerations for the reviewer where they are exposed to unpublished work/ideas and must not incorporate those ideas into their own before the paper is published.

- What did you learn from this reading?

I liked the idea put forward early that the "responsibility of a program committee member is to accept papers, and not to find flaws and reject work at every opportunity." This champions the idea that much of the research should be put out so that the field has a chance to accept/reject ideas rather than the few reviewing the papers. I also learned from the idea that "a paper doesn't necessarily have to be 'ambitious' to be important and publishable." The idea that small contributions can be valuable as a reviewer and a researcher is important. Not everything will be earth-shaking findings, but pushing the conversations around certain areas into new realms can come from the smallest details.

Another illuminating statement was that there are a whole spectrum of ideas, some will be forgotten, some will cause a lot of buzz, some will not pan out, but as the reviewer the obligation is to let these ideas into the field/world so they can find their own lives. Hinckley writes, "it is important to realize that any and all of these outcomes are okay, even desired." This means a journal's or conference's publishing should not all lead to highly cited successful articles, but that a well-rounded journal/conference will have papers with ideas that will end up across the spectrum. The mantra Hinckley writes about also relates to this idea, "when in doubt, trust the literature to sort it out." Let the ideas out into the world and let them take on the life they were intended to by being exposed to as many minds as possible.

I also learned that a good review requires a lot from the reviewer, including listing positive things about the paper as well as limitations. The good reviewer is also challenged to propose new connections to work and areas the author might not have considered. The good reviewer should also raise new questions for the author to consider. I was unaware that there are primary and secondary reviewers, and that secondary reviewers are similar to external reviewers. The primary reviewer has the responsibility of the meta reviewer summing up the comments from all the reviewers but also including your own perspectives and commentary. The goal of all the comments from reviewers should be to help authors produce the best paper possible. I also learned the tip that reviewing a lot of papers will make you a better paper writer.

- **What questions do you still have?**

- How do you get to be a reviewer?
- What happens if you don't feel knowledgeable enough about an area once you have already been assigned a paper to review?
- How often are reviewers rotated/changed for journals/conferences?
- Is there some sort of training/certification you have to go through to become a reviewer?

- **Identify at least two types of HCI contributions you are most interested in reading as a reviewer.**

- Argument – it seems like many of these papers would be like the Paul Dourish articles we have read. I think reviewing these papers would be more fun as they are broad and less technical.
- Innovation, Creativity, and Vision – I think my experience in the arts would help place some new interfaces/ideas in the history of creative thought.

- **Identify at least two types of contributions you are interested in making with your future research.**

- Theory – I'd like to get to the point when I am working with larger ideas and approaches to interaction.
- Argument – I'd like to get back to my philosophical roots eventually and write about HCI ideas broadly.
- Innovation, Creativity, and Vision – This seems my best fit right now as I am creating a lot of novel interaction techniques for my own use.
- Methodology – Hopefully my dissertation will contribute new autoethnographic methods of reflection, self-review, and writing.
- Development or Refinement of Interface Artifacts or Techniques – My novel interface arts practice fits well within this area as well.