

Instructions for Authors: Formulating Questions and Making Relevance Assessments

Anna.Ritchie@cl.cam.ac.uk

November 16, 2005

The purpose of this experiment is to build a collection of queries and relevance assessments for a corpus of computational linguistics papers. You will be asked to write down the problem(s) that your paper dealt with and to assess how relevant each of the references in your reference list are in relation to those problems.

1 Main Problem

Write down, in the form of a question (one sentence), the basic problem that your paper addressed, i.e, that was the focus of your work.

2 Further Problems

Write down any additional/subsidiary/subordinate problems that affected your work, if any. These might be more general problems, the solution of which your research contributed to, or subproblems...

- for which it was necessary to find new or existing solutions to in order to carry out the main research.
- relating to the methodology used in the work, rather than the theoretical research problem.

(It is perfectly possible that your paper was influenced by only one problem, in which case, proceed to step 3.)

3 Relevance Assessments

In tabular form, for each reference in your paper's reference list, assign a score to indicate the relevance of that reference to each of the problems you have written down for 1 and 2, using the scale given in Table 1.

Relevance	Description and Examples
4	<p>The reference is crucially relevant to the problem. Knowledge of the contents of the referred work will be fundamental to the reader's understanding of your paper. Often, such relevant references are afforded a substantial amount of text in a paper e.g., a thorough summary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of subproblems, the reference may provide a complete solution (e.g., a reference explaining an important tool used or method adopted for the research) • In the case of the main problem, the reference may provide a complete solution (e.g., an existing, alternative solution to the problem that your work directly contrasts or proves incorrect). • In either case, the reference may provide a partial solution that your work builds upon (e.g., previous work of your own or others that your current work extends or improves).
3	<p>The reference is relevant to the problem. It may be helpful for the reader to know the contents of the referred work, but not crucial. The reference could not have been substituted or dropped without making significant additions to the text. A few sentences may be associated with the reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference may be the standard reference given for a particular tool or method used, of which an understanding is not necessarily required to follow your paper. • The referred work may give an alternative approach to the problem that is not being directly compared in the current work. • The referred work may give an approach to a similar or related problem.
2	<p>The reference is somewhat (perhaps indirectly) relevant to the problem. Following up the reference probably would not improve the reader's understanding of your paper. Alternative references may have been equally appropriate (e.g., the reference was chosen as a representative example from a number of similar references or included in a list of similar references). Or the reference could have been dropped without damaging the informativeness of your paper. Minimal text will be associated with the reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference may be included to give some historical background to the problem. • The reference may be included to acknowledge a (non-critical) contribution.
1	<p>The reference is irrelevant to this particular problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.g., a reference about an implementation strategy may be irrelevant to a subproblem about evaluation strategy.

Table 1: Relevance Scale