Review Quality Collector (RQC) receipt for ABCD 2030

Alice Thorough (a.t@some.com) has provided 3 reviews to ABCD 2030 (A Bit Cautious) as follows:

A	D	G	T	total	percentile
93	79	100	80	88	83
85	80	100	97	93	100
—	—	100	98	—	—
			Overall:	104	100

The overall score for these reviews is 104, resulting in an **overall ranking percentile of 100** (100 is best).

This makes Alice Thorough a top 5% reviewer (i.e. in the 94.5 to 100 percentile range).

A, *D*, *G*, and *T* are the aspects according to the following review quality definition, *total* is the score per review, and *percentile* is the per-review ranking. The overall score results from various computations defined at the bottom of the review quality definition and builds on the per-review scores only, the per-review percentiles are shown only for information and do not relate to the end result directly.

Underlying review quality definition (RQdef)

The following criteria are specific to ABCD 2030. Other venues may use the same or different criteria for their review grading, but the set of aspects A, D, G, and T (as reflected in the table above) is always the same.

Aspect *Helpfulness for Authors* (weight 19)

Facet *Is constructive* (localweight 77)

- The review offers suggestions or ideas for how to make the actual improvements for all or nearly all points of substantial criticism (100 points)
- For much, but not nearly all criticism (50 points)
- Only rarely or never (0 points)

Facet *Provides evidence* (localweight 57)

- The review provides justification or good explanation for all or nearly all points of substantial criticism in such a form that average authors are likely able to accept the criticism as valid (100 points)
- For much, but not nearly all criticism (50 points)
- Only rarely or never (0 points)

Facet *Uses a friendly tone* (localweight 55)

- The review uses a friendly or polite tone throughout and phrases all its criticism gently. (100 points)
- With some exceptions (50 points)
- Very often not (0 points)

Aspect *Helpfulness for Decision* (weight 27)

Facet *Is thorough in breadth* (localweight 37)

- The review discusses all aspects of the article worth discussing instead of only some of them (100 points)
- It ignores one or two relevant aspects (66 points)
- The review selectively discusses only a modest fraction of the relevant aspects (33 points)
- The review discusses hardly anything of relevance (0 points)

Facet *Criticism is specific* (localweight 57)

- For its criticism, the review is always specific what it applies to and where in the article this is to be found (100 points)
- It is often or usually specific (50 points)
- Only rarely or never (0 points)

Facet *Criticism is justified* (localweight 59)

- For its criticism, the review always provides reasoning or argumentation why a particular point is problematic and how: incomplete, illogical, inappropriate for the purpose, inconsistent with something else, etc. (100 points)
- The justification is missing for at least one important point of criticism (50 points)
- The justification is frequently missing (0 points)

Facet *Weighs its items* (localweight 51)

- The review visibly allocates more weight to important mentioned points of criticism and praise than to unimportant points (100 points)
- Does so for either criticism or praise, but not both (66 points)
- Does so only vaguely (33 points)
- Does not visibly weigh (0 points)

Facet *Provides criticism and praise* (localweight 27)

- The review mentions several non-trivial points of criticism and of praise, not only one of these (100 points)
- Does so for either criticism or praise, but not both (66 points)
- Does so only vaguely (33 points)
- Provides little substance at all (0 points)

Aspect *Graded Co-Reviews* **(weight 49)**

Aspect *Timeliness* **(weight 47)**

- at least 2 days early (100 points) (100 points)
- at least 6 hours early (98 points) (98 points)
- at least 1 hour early (97 points) (97 points)
- at least 0 hours early (96 points) (96 points)
- at most 1 hour late (80 points) (80 points)
- at most 6 hours late (70 points) (70 points)
- at most 1 day late (50 points) (50 points)
- otherwise(0 point) (0 points)

Global settings

The review quality definition also states that the overall score should be computed as follows: Ignore all but the k best reviews, where k is chosen such that 75 percent of all reviewers have done at most that many reviews. For the remaining ones, compute the mean score via the arithmetic mean. Finally, the mean is multiplied by the eighth root of the number of reviews provided by the reviewer.

For elaboration on the meaning of this review quality definition and the computations that lead to the ranking, see `https://reviewqualitycollector.org/t/grading-system`.

Learn more about Review Quality Collector at `https://reviewqualitycollector.org`.
Receipt issued Tue 2016-08-09 08:06 UTC, PDF rendered Tue 2016-08-09 08:06 UTC.