Review Questions

+ Add new question   Preview

type to filter…

1. * Summary and contributions: Briefly summarize the paper and its contributions (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers).
Type: Comment

2. * Strengths: Describe the strengths of the work. Typical criteria include: soundness of the claims (theoretical grounding, empirical evaluation), significance and novelty of the contribution, and relevance to the community (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers).
Type: Comment

3. * Weaknesses: Explain the limitations of this work along the same axes as above (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers).
Type: Comment

4. * Correctness: Are the claims and method correct? Is the empirical methodology correct? (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Comment

5. * Clarity: Is the paper well written? (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Comment

6. * Relation to prior work/relevant work:
Do the authors connect to prior work at all? If so, do the authors clearly discuss how the proposed work differs from previous contributions? (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Comment

7. * Reproducibility: Are there enough details to reproduce the major results of this work? (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Options
- Yes, the work is reproducible
- Some aspects of the work are reproducible
- No, the work is not reproducible

8. * Additional feedback, comments, suggestions for improvement and questions for the authors: (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Comment

9. * Please provide an "overall score" for this submission. (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Options with value
- Top 5% of accepted Datathon papers. Truly groundbreaking work.
- Top 15% of accepted Datathon papers. An excellent submission; a strong accept.
- Top 50% of accepted Datathon papers. A very good submission; a clear accept.
- A good submission; an accept.
- Marginally above the acceptance threshold.
- Marginally below the acceptance threshold.
- An okay submission, but not good enough; a reject.
- A clear reject.
- Major errors, fatal flaws. A strong reject

10. * Please provide a "confidence score" for your assessment of this submission. (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Options
- 1: Your assessment is an educated guess.
- 2: You are willing to defend your assessment, but it is quite likely that you did not understand central parts of the submission or that you are unfamiliar with some pieces of related work. Math/other details were not carefully checked.
- 3: You are fairly confident in your assessment.
- 4: You are confident in your assessment, but not absolutely certain.
- 5: You are absolutely certain about your assessment.

11. * Does the submission raise potential ethical concerns? This includes methods, applications, or data that create or reinforce unfair bias or that have a primary purpose of harm or injury. If so, please explain these in detail. (visible to authors during feedback, visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)
Type: Comment

12. If you have any confidential comments for the Datathon Chairs, please provide them here.
Type: Comment