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Clarity / Writing Style (1-5):

5 = Very clear.

4 = Understandable.

3 = Mostly understandable.

2 = Important questions are hard to resolve.

1 = Much of the paper is confusing.

Originality / Innovativeness (1-5):

Note that a paper could score high for originality even if the results do not show a convincing benefit.

5 = Noteworthy new problem, technique, methodology, or insight.

4 = Creative: Relatively few people in our community would have put these ideas together.

3 = Somewhat conventional.

2 = Obvious, or a minor improvement on familiar techniques.

1 = Significant portions have actually been done before or done better.

Impact of Ideas and/or Results (1-5):

5 = Will affect the field.

4 = Some of the ideas/results will substantially help other people's ongoing research.

3 = Interesting but not too influential.

2 = Marginally interesting.

1 = Will have no impact on the field.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (1-5):

This is the score that will be used for the ranking of the paper.

5 = Top paper (does not need to be award winning though).

4 = Very good paper (only the 25% of the papers should have this ranking or higher).

3 = Borderline: Needs lots of discussion.

2 = Mediocre: Too many weaknesses.

1 = Poor.

Reviewer Confidence (1-3):

1 = Low.

2 = Medium.

3 = High.

Summarize shortly the contributions of the paper in your own words.

Summary should explain shortly (in 1-3 sentences) the main technical contribution. Do not discuss strengths and weaknesses here.

Strengths

What are the strengths of the paper? Itemized list of max 5 strongest points (just list shortly).

Weaknesses

What are the weaknesses of the paper? Itemized list of max 5 weakest points (just list shortly).