

Final Report Reviews for Prof. & TAs

* Required

1. Andrew ID *

2. Team Reviewed *

3. In a few words, please briefly describe the subject of this work. *

Problem Statement

4. Problem Statement: Do the authors make clear their applied or theoretical problem? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

5. Problem Statement: Reviewer Justification *

Literature Review

6. Literature Review: Do the authors review and explain enough papers to clearly contextualize their work? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

7. Literature Review: Reviewer Justification *

Model / Theory / Algorithm Definition

8. Model / Theory / Algorithm Definition: Is the core model / theory / algorithm clear? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

9. Model / Theory / Algorithm Definition: Reviewer Justification *

Evaluation Methodology

10. Evaluation Methodology: Is the process of evaluation clear? Is it clear what the evaluation metrics are and why they are used? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

11. Evaluation Methodology: Reviewer Justification *

Training Methodology

12. Training Methodology: Is the process of training clear such that you could reproduce it given their model / theory / algorithm? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

13. Training Methodology: Reviewer Justification *

Ablation Study

14. Ablation Study: Do the authors do a sufficient job experimenting with different specifications? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

15. Ablation Study: Reviewer Justification *

Baseline Result Comparison

16. Baseline Result Comparison: Are the results presented with a clear interpretation? Are the implications of these findings clear? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

17. Baseline Result Comparison: Reviewer Justification *

Conclusion

18. Conclusion: Do the authors summarize their major findings? Is it clear what progress they made or what future work needs to be done? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

19. Conclusion: Reviewer Justification *

Completeness

20. Completeness: How close are the authors on providing an answer to their problem statement? *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

21. Completeness: Reviewer Justification *

Novelty and Publishability

22. Novelty and Publishability: Are the authors investigating a current state-of-the-art approach, proposing a novel approach, or solving a new problem? In the case of the later two, are the results publishable? (Approach refers to a model / theory / algorithm central to the paper.) *

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructions on Reviewer Justification

For each point deducted, clearly state what was missing, incorrect, or incomplete in the paper. There should be at least one statement for each point deduction. (These statements do not directly affect student grades. They will be used internally to resolve disputes.)

For a perfect score only, clearly state why it is perfect. If they exceeded expectations, what did they do? (This statement does not directly affect student grades. It will be used internally to improve future project expectations.)

23. Novelty and Publishability: Reviewer Justification *

Comments (Optional)

24. (Optional) If you have any comments, please note them here.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms