Viewing of Reviewer Ratings and Comments for Authors and Reviewers

Return to ITiCSE 2005 General Information Page

Paper123: Student-Built Algorithm Visualizations for Assessment: Flexible Generation, Feedback and Grading

Review Summary

Anonymous Reviewer Code	Technical	Organization	Originality	Significance	Overall Score
A	3	3	4	4	4
B	4	3	4	4	4
C	5	5	5	5	5
D	2	2	4	2	2
E	6	6	5	5	5
Avg. of 5 Revs.	**4**	**3.8**	**4.4**	**4**	**4**

Author-Recommended Subjects: Algorithms, Multimedia

Reviews from Individual Reviewers Follow

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Graphics/Visualization
Technical Score:	3	**Comments:** The technical content was OK.
Organization Score:	3	**Comments:** Figures 2-5 should be a bit larger. It is somewhat difficult to get a good feel for the MA&DA system from just a short narrative description of the overall architecture. I would like to have seen more details on explaining its operation so I can better understand its capabilities and limitations.
Originality Score:	4	**Comments:** This is an original extension of earlier work on student-generated visualizations with provisions for automatic feedback and grading.

Significance Score:	4	**Comments:** This work appears to be a significant step forward in the effective use of visualization in the CS classroom.
Overall Score:	4	**Comments:** A good paper.
Oral Presentation Comments: Please include some live demonstrations of exercise generation, execution, and evaluation.		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Algorithms CS1/2 Lab Environments Web-based Techniques and Web Services
Technical Score:	4	**Comments:** The paper describes an ongoing research undertaken for several years by the authoring team. The paedagogical aspects of algorithmic animation are categorized and special focus is made for the "construction" level.
Organization Score:	3	**Comments:** Although the authros tried to respect the rules of the "blind review" process, Google is more powerfull than what think about it. For a single keyword "Jedas", the affiliation of the authors comes up. http://www.informatik.uni-freiburg.de/~rmueller/jedas/ Regardless of this fact, the paper is well ballanced between theoretical issues and practical presentation.
Originality Score:	4	**Comments:** Results have been partially published before. In any case there is a certain added value.
Significance Score:	4	**Comments:** Of standard significance level with other papers accepted in the past in the same conference.
Overall Score:	4	**Comments:** Although I was not enthusiastic while reading the apper, however, the paper demonstrated a certain added value and thus I recommend acceptance of the paper.
Oral Presentation Comments: Several extra examples (except the heaps) could improve the presentation.		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Algorithms Graphics/Visualization Courseware Pedagogy
Technical Score:	5	**Comments:** very nicely done paper; technically the animation system employed, MA&DA, builds on the work of others and attempts to enhance what has already been done.
Organization Score:	5	**Comments:** Nicely written paper; based on the organization of the paper, it is easy to understand what the issues are, what some of the good things and deficiences

		are with current algorithm visualization systems and how this software tool attempts to improve on the work of others.
Originality Score:	5	**Comments:** Nice follow-up to the current state of deevelopment in building pedagogically-sound algorithm visualization software
Significance Score:	5	**Comments:** Significant contribution to the software tools already in use.
Overall Score:	5	**Comments:** Very nice presentation for the authors' work; should be included in the program.
Oral Presentation Comments: Spend time showing how the system works; maybe demonstrate the complete system on a mini-example		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Algorithms Graphics/Visualization Courseware
Technical Score:	2	**Comments:** This is the kind of paper that does a good job presenting something that needs to be evaluated directly. The 5 page limit also seems to be a big problem for effectively presenting this system. I believe the result is a clear compromise between the system features and the space to present them. The system just seems to have too many features for a 5 page paper. Although the system does have a lot of features, the reader is left with the idea that more supporting material should be made available. It is also not clear if there are clear and complete instructions for users. The author state the system is not ready for regular use. In this sense, the paper seems premature. It is not clear what the four components are. Are they independent applications? Written in what language? What platforms do we need to run them? Is the system freeware? Is it available for download?
Organization Score:	2	**Comments:** Overall the paper is well organized. The figures readability should be improved. There should be some text between 4.2 and 4.2.1 headings. The same for 4.3 and 4.3.1.. The components' names in fig. 1 are not the same as the ones used in the text: e.g. "EvalEditor" and "evaluation editor". It is not clear if figure 3 is the "work editor". Probably a reference to figure 3 should be added. Figure 2 is not referenced in the text. The text in the acknowledgments section should be avoided in an anonymous paper. The references do not mention the publishers.
Originality Score:	4	**Comments:** I have no significant experience with this kind of systems. Yet, I dare to say the system is quite original due to its flexibility.
Significance	2	**Comments:** The described system does seem to be

Score:		useful and flexible enough to be used in different settings. The main problem is in its apparent immaturity regarding the available plug-ins for additional data structures. This makes me wonder if the system is ready to be used with other data structures.
Overall Score:	2	**Comments:** The presented software system clearly deserves to be made known to the community yet it is not clear from the paper if the system supports other data structures besides the fibonacci-heap. It seems to be "complete" but the authors state that it is not ready to be used: "For regular use in actual courses, plug-ins for additional data structures need to be implemented."
Oral Presentation Comments: How about avoiding the classic slide-based presentation and instead show the use of the four components for a simple enough example?		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		CS1/2 Courseware Lab Environments Using Emerging Instructional Technologies
Technical Score:	6	**Comments:** The author is knowledgeable in data structure instruction and in other (related) systems. He/she has done appropriate research and analysis of related systems.
Organization Score:	6	**Comments:** The paper is easy to follow and appropriately breaks apart the example and grading of assignments with the system.
Originality Score:	5	**Comments:** There are several courseware programs in this area that have been developed in recent years, but the authors set theirs apart as adding to the area and being useful to instructors.
Significance Score:	5	**Comments:** Tools that can be integrated into labs or into class activities/assignments for a data structures course are always needed, especially tools that facilitate experimentation by the studnt and in grading by faculty.
Overall Score:	5	**Comments:** The authors make a significant contribution to the area and provide a useful tool that others can use. For this, I recommend the paper.
Oral Presentation Comments: I suggest demonstrating the system with the example from the paper or another.		

Return to ITiCSE 2005 General Information Page