



Sasirekha S. <sasirekhas@ssn.edu.in>

Fwd: Your SemEval 2023 Submission (Number 100) review comments

1 message

Thaya I M <thayaim@ssn.edu.in>
To: "Sasirekha S." <sasirekhas@ssn.edu.in>

Fri, Apr 7, 2023 at 8:52 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **SemEval2023** <SemEval2023_acl2023@softconf.com>
Date: Fri, 7 Apr, 2023, 01:25
Subject: Your SemEval 2023 Submission (Number 100)
To: <thayaim@ssn.edu.in>

Dear Thaya IM:

On behalf of the SemEval 2023 Program Committee, we are delighted to inform you that the following submission has been accepted to appear at the conference:

OPEN SESAME at SemEval-2023 Task A, B, and C

The Program Committee worked very hard to thoroughly review all the submitted papers. Please repay their efforts, by following their suggestions when you revise your paper.

When you are finished, you can upload your final manuscript at the following site by April 21, 2023:

<https://softconf.com/acl2023/SemEval2023/>

You will be prompted to log in to your START account. If you do not see your submission, you can access it with the following passcode:

100X-P6D3E6P4B6

Alternatively, you can click on the following URL, which will take you directly to a form to submit your final paper (after logging into your account):

<https://softconf.com/acl2023/SemEval2023/user/scmd.cgi?scmd=aLogin&passcode=100X-P6D3E6P4B6>

The reviews and comments are attached below. Again, please try to follow their advice when you revise your paper as per [ACL paper style](#) (it is strictly mandatory). Please note that the paper will not include in the proceedings if you fail to incorporate reviewers' comments.

Congratulations on your fine work. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to get in touch.

Best Regards,
Organizers
SemEval 2023

=====
SemEval 2023 Reviews for Submission #100
=====

Title: OPEN SESAME at SemEval-2023 Task A, B, and C
Authors: SASIREKHA S, Thaya IM, Kanyalakshmi G and Arun N

=====

REVIEWER #1

=====

Reviewer's Scores

Appropriateness (1-5): 5
Clarity (1-5): 1
Originality / Innovativeness (1-5): 2
Soundness / Correctness (1-5): 3
Meaningful Comparison (1-5): 3

Detailed Comments

The present paper is very hard to read. A lot of sentences are missing verbs and/or are typo-ridden.
The approach is also very standard and not innovative in any way.

A few points before diving into the details of the paper:

Are you sure you are using the right template? While it does look like an ACL template, it looks somewhat different than other submissions I saw, including in the citation type (numbers instead of names). Official template is here: <https://www.overleaf.com/latex/templates/acl-2023-proceedings-template/qjdgcrdwcwmp>

You need to cite the task paper:

```
@inproceedings{kirkSemEval2023,  
title = {{SemEval}-2023 {Task} 10: {Explainable} {Detection} of {Online} {Sexism}},  
url = {http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.04222},  
doi = {10.48550/arXiv.2303.04222},  
author = {Kirk, Hannah Rose and Yin, Wenjie and Vidgen, Bertie and Röttger, Paul},  
booktitle = {Proceedings of the 17th {{International Workshop}} on {{Semantic Evaluation}} ({{SemEval-2023}})},  
publisher = {{Association for Computational Linguistics}},  
year = {2023}  
}
```

What do the 1,2,3,4 next to your names refer to? If it's author order, these are not necessary

I advise you to use ChatGPT or another tool to reformulate your paper in plain and fluid English, it is otherwise impossible imo to accept the paper in the present form

Diving deeper:

Page 1-2 (Introduction): Listing relevant papers and summarizing them (ideally clearly) is not enough for a literature review. You need to see how each paper feeds into the next and summarize the contributions.

Page 4 (experimental setup):

- More discussion on method choice is needed
- why doing downsampling in one case and upsampling in another case? Also, explain clearly how this was performed.

Page 4 (Result):

- I guess you meant "Results"?
 - The evaluation metrics which are central for the results part are not given in the results part. They are given in the abstract but should be repeated in the results section. More discussion on the results is also needed
-

=====

REVIEWER #2

=====

Reviewer's Scores

Appropriateness (1-5): 4
Clarity (1-5): 2
Originality / Innovativeness (1-5): 1
Soundness / Correctness (1-5): 2
Meaningful Comparison (1-5): 2

Detailed Comments

The references are done badly, the text is written incredibly badly, and you provide verbatim examples of content - which is unethical.

The results are hard to understand as you dont follow a conventional experimental setup - so im not really sure what you are reporting. As far as I can tell, they dont provide any novel insight.

This is a hard No.

--
SemEval 2023 - <https://softconf.com/acl2023/SemEval2023>

::DISCLAIMER::

The contents of this e-mail and any attachment(s) are confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. Views or opinions, if any, presented in this email are solely those of the author and may not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of SSN Institutions (SSN) or its affiliates. Any form of reproduction, dissemination, copying, disclosure, modification, distribution and / or publication of this message without the prior written consent of authorized representative of SSN is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please delete it and notify the sender immediately.

Header of this mail should have a valid DKIM signature for the domain ssn.edu.in