

Review – Submission 1

Man-Computer Symbiosis

Review

Recommendation *

- ☐ Reject: Content inappropriate to the conference or has little merit
- ☐ Probable Reject: Basic flaws in content or presentation or very poorly written
- ☐ Marginal Tend to Reject: Not as badly flawed; major effort necessary to make acceptable but content well-covered in literature already
- ☐ Marginal Tend to Accept: Content has merit, but accuracy, clarity, completeness, and/or writing should and could be improved in time
- ☒ Clear Accept: Content, presentation, and writing meet professional norms; improvements may be advisable but acceptable as is
- ☐ Must Accept: Candidate for outstanding submission. Suggested improvements still appropriate

Submission Categorization

- ☐ Highly theoretical
- ☒ Tends towards theoretical
- ☐ Balanced theory and practice
- ☐ Tends toward practical
- ☐ Highly practical

Overall Value Added to the Field

Check as many as appropriate

- ☒ New information
- ☐ Valuable confirmation of present knowledge
- ☐ Clarity to present understanding
- ☒ New perspective, issue, or problem definition
- ☐ Not much
- ☐ Other

Reviewer Familiarity with Subject Matter

Relates to the confidence you have in your review

- ☐ Low
- ☐ Moderate
- ☒ High

Is this submission a candidate for the best submission award

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure

Is the submission length appropriate

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure

If from reading the submission you know who the author is, how different is this from earlier submissions on the same topic by the same author? That is, is it the same as or a slight modification of other submissions, with little or no new information

We use these suggestions in assigning submissions to sessions for the conference, but not in determining whether the submission is accepted)

- ☐ Totally or largely different from other submissions
- ☒ Moderately different from other submissions
- ☐ Totally or largely identical to other submissions
- ☐ Don't know

Which of the following session(s) would be the most appropriate for this submission

We use these suggestions in assigning submissions to sessions for the conference, but not in determining whether the submission is accepted)

- ☒ Classic Papers
- ☐ Programming
- ☐ RFC
- ☐ Computer Science
- ☐ Networking
- ☐ Humo(u)r

Comments for the Authors

Constructive comments to the author(s) would be appreciated.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Vivamus lectus. Suspendisse potenti. Proin velit. Proin vehicula justo sit amet massa. Cras rhoncus pellentesque dolor. Integer placerat, tellus id porta posuere, lacus est feugiat leo, eget sollicitudin augue nibh in augue.

Comments for the Program Committee (authors will not see these comments)

Reasons must be included for all submissions, because they help us determine what to do when reviewers disagree with each other.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Vivamus lectus. Suspendisse potenti. Proin velit. Proin vehicula justo sit amet massa. Cras rhoncus pellentesque dolor. Integer placerat, tellus id porta posuere, lacus est feugiat leo, eget sollicitudin augue nibh in augue.

☒ Email me the filled out form fields

For your records.

☒ I have completed the review

Check this box when you have finished the review for this submission. This is used only to track how many outstanding reviews there are. You will still be able to edit this review after checking this box, until the review deadline date.

Save Review