# Paper Review:
# *Paper title

## Reviewed by *yourname

## 1.   PRIVATE COMMENTS

State which aspects of the paper you did not review in depth (e.g., you did not check the proofs) and provide confidential information (this box is only visible by the ACs and the program chairs and will NOT be published). [TEXT BOX]

## 2.   SUMMARY

Provide a brief summary of the paper.

## 3.   FATAL FLAWS

Does the paper have a "fatal flaw" making it unfit for publication, regardless of other criteria (may include out of scope, double publication, plagiarism, wrong proofs, flawed experiments)? Use the text box to justify your answer.

* Not as far as I can see

## 4.   TECHNICAL QUALITY

(whether experimental methods are appropriate, proofs are sound, results are well analyzed))

5- Award level (1/1000 submissions)

4- Oral level (top 3

3-Poster level (top 30

2-Sub-standard for NIPS

1-Low or very low

## 5.   NOVELTY/ORIGINALITY

(in any aspect of the work, theory, algorithm, applications, experimental):

5- Award level (1/1000 submissions)

4- Oral level (top 3

3-Poster level (top 30

2-Sub-standard for NIPS

1-Low or very low

## 6.   POTENTIAL IMPACT OR USEFULNESS

(could be societal, academic, or practical and should be lasting in time, affecting a large number of people and/or bridge the gap between multiple disciplines):

5- Award level (1/1000 submissions)

4- Oral level (top 3

3-Poster level (top 30

2-Sub-standard for NIPS

1-Low or very low

## 7.   CLARITY AND PRESENTATION

(explanations, language and grammar, figures, graphs, tables, proper references):

5- Award level (1/1000 submissions)

4- Oral level (top 3

3-Poster level (top 30

2-Sub-standard for NIPS

1-Low or very low

## 8.   QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

Provide constructive feedback to the authors; justify and complement your ratings above; this box is of the utmost importance in the decision making process. The authors have explained their approach with the help of very good diagrams. Understanding why certain crucial techniques work requires further reading of their previous paper on texture synthesis, and is not evident in this paper.

## 9.   REVIEWER CONFIDENCE REGARDING THIS REVIEW

3-Expert (read the paper in details, quite certain of my opinion)

2-Confident (read it all; understood it all reasonably well)

1-Less confident (might not have understood significant parts)