



 Required fields are shown in red, with an asterisk (*).

Title: Single image reflection removal via learning through optimization

Area: Imaging/Video

Submission: [details](#)

Submission Packet:  [packet](#)



Please read the [Reviewer Instructions & Ethics of Review](#) page before reviewing.

Be thorough. Be fair. Be courteous. Provide evidence and references for your statements. Above all, be open to new ideas and be constructive.

If the paper is a resubmission with reviewer continuity, please assess how well this revision takes into account previous reviews, and how it improved. The reviewing system gives you access to the former reviews and the authors were instructed to upload a cover letter outlining the changes to their work as supplementary material.

Your evaluation will be forwarded to the authors during the rebuttal period. Please be judicious in asking questions to be answered during rebuttal. Papers should be judged as submitted and thus authors should not be expected to produce new results or conduct additional experiments during the rebuttal period.

Description

Briefly describe the paper including its topic and the nature of its contribution (e.g., a study, an algorithm, a system, a benchmark...). Give your assessment of the scope, originality, and magnitude of the contribution.

Description* † ✓

[math](#) · [markdown](#) · [preview](#)

Clarity of Exposition

Are the exposition and presentation clear? How could they be improved? Is the length of the paper justified, assuming a recommended length of 8–10 pages plus references?

Please be tolerant of papers that do not conform to the usual paper template.

Clarity of Exposition* † ✓

[math](#) · [markdown](#) · [preview](#)

Quality of References

Are all the relevant papers discussed and, conversely, are all the references relevant to the presented work? Indicate any missing or superfluous references. Are all the cited papers accurately discussed in the context of the submission?

Quality of References* † ✓

The references are good, except for missing a recent conference paper:

[1] Ruozi Huang, Huang Hu, Wei Wu, Kei Sawada, Mi Zhang and Daxin Jiang. Dance Revolution: Long-Term Dance Generation with Music via Curriculum Learning, ICLR 2021.

[math](#) · [markdown](#) · [preview](#)

Technical Correctness and Reproducibility

Is the technical content of the paper correct? Are all important details (e.g., algorithm, study protocol, benchmark metric, training procedure...) discussed adequately? Could the work be reproduced from the information in the paper?

Remember that the authors may not be able to share their code/data for various reasons. Submissions should not be penalized for the lack of code/data, even though such additional material often has a positive effect on the review process. Regardless of whether the code/data is provided, one should be able to recreate it from the paper and you may request additional information if needed.

Technical Correctness and Reproducibility* † ✓

[math](#) · [markdown](#) · [preview](#)

Validation

Does the validation support the claims of the paper? Are the limitations and drawbacks of the work clear?

Remember that different types of contributions require different types of validation and that not everything needs to be demonstrated on an end-to-end application or with a user study. Adjust the expectation to the originality of the contribution; while extensive testing is expected for a refinement

of a well-established approach, a lighter-weight validation may be acceptable for a groundbreaking idea.

If asking for additional experiments, be mindful that the required resources should not exceed those of a typical lab or those already demonstrated in the submission. When requesting comparisons to previous papers, provide links to the code/data of these papers (if no such code/data exists, consider limiting the request to a discussion). If needed, include suggestions to keep the paper length adequate.

Validation* † ✓

[math](#) · [markdown](#) · [preview](#)

Scored Review Questions

Please enter your recommendation, basing your rating on the paper as it was submitted.

Recommendation* † ✓

Please describe your expertise on the topic of the paper.*

Comments

Explanation of Rating: Explain your rating by discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the submission, contributions, and the potential impact of the paper. Remember to adjust your expectation to the type and originality of the contribution. Include suggestions for improvement and publication alternatives, if appropriate. Be thorough. Be fair. Be courteous. Provide evidence and references for your statements. Above all, be open to new ideas and be constructive.* † ✓

[math](#) · [markdown](#) · [preview](#)

Private Comments: You may enter private comments for the papers committee here. These comments will not be sent to the paper author(s). Please do not mention any names or any other papers that are currently in review. You may use this field to comment on your reviewer expertise and confidence in evaluation.

[math](#) · [markdown](#) · [preview](#)

Email Review to Reviewer

☐ Would you like to receive a copy of this review by email?

† Answers to questions with this symbol will be visible to contributors during the rebuttal period.

✓ Answers to questions with this symbol will be visible to contributors when final reviews are made visible to them.

[← Return to Previous Review](#)

Submit

Submit and Continue to Next Review

[Skip to Next Review →](#)

Confirmation of Review: You should confirm that your review has been successfully received by the server in at least one of three ways: (1) check the 'email' box and have a copy of your review emailed to you, (2) make sure you see a *confirmation* page (and not an *error* page) upon submitting your review, and/or (3) note that the 'review' link from which you obtained this review page changes to an 'update' link upon refreshing the page.

There are four, and only four, known problems that would prevent your review from being received: (a) a network problem between you and the server when you submit, (b) session time out before you submit, (c) errors in your submitted review form, and/or (d) forgetting to click the 'submit' button.

To cancel the submission of this review, simply close the window.

[SIGGRAPH 2021 Site](#)[Powered by Linklings](#)[Privacy Policies](#)