

## “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 <b>⑤</b> ⑥ ⑦	Does paper title corresponds to paper content? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Originality: ① ② ③ ④ <b>⑤</b> ⑥ ⑦	Does annotation corresponds to paper content? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Presentation quality: ① ② <b>③</b> ④ ⑤ ⑥ 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 type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> Almost <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Clarity of presentation: ① ② ③ <b>④</b> ⑤ ⑥ ⑦	Does references to literature are fitting and sufficient? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> Almost <input type="radio"/> No
Final evaluation of reviewer: ① ② ③ <b>④</b> ⑤ ⑥ ⑦	

\* Evaluation meaning:

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

### Remarks for author(s):

The text does not complies the requirements for papers.

Author(s) should arrange/adjust/neaten the presented material, in order it would look as paper.

The topic under investigation is interesting.

----- ✂ ----- ✂ -----