

“Computer Days – 2007” Review

Paper No.: 39

Paper title: **Hinton & Nowlan's computational Baldwin effect revisit: Are we happy with it?**

Evaluation*

Scientific importance of the topic: ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ <u>⑥</u> ⑦	Does paper title corresponds to paper content? <input checked="" type="radio"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="radio"/> No
Originality: ① ② ③ <u>④</u> ⑤ ⑥ ⑦	Does annotation corresponds to paper content? <input checked="" type="radio"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="radio"/> No
Presentation quality: ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ <u>⑥</u> ⑦	Does the paper meets requirements for scientific papers (i.e., does the paper contains introduction, indicated aim of research, consideration of problem investigation level, object of investigation, methods, received results, conclusions, list of references?) <input checked="" type="radio"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="radio"/> Almost <input type="radio"/> No
Clarity of presentation: ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ <u>⑥</u> ⑦	Does references to literature are fitting and sufficient? <input checked="" type="radio"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="radio"/> Almost <input type="radio"/> No
Final evaluation of reviewer: ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ <u>⑦</u>	

* Evaluation meaning:

① strong reject; **②** reject; **③** weak reject; **④** neutral; **⑤** weak accept; **⑥** accept; **⑦** strong accept

Remarks for author(s):

On my opinion, it is good written conference paper and, of course, may be presented at the Conference.

----- ✂ ----- ✂ -----