AI & Robotics Seminar
Review Reading Assignments

Marc Toussaint
Learning & Intelligent Systems Lab, TU Berlin
Marchstr. 23, 10587 Berlin, Germany

Summer 2023

1 Some more details on Review Reading Assignments

Please focus on reading the main reviews (for now excluding the meta-review) and the rebuttal (responses) of the authors. In our discussion meeting we will go through these reviews.

Reviews should comment on *originality, quality, significance, and clarity* – please first read below what these mean. In our discussion, please be able to state for each comment whether it refers to originality, quality, significance, or clarity, and whether it is consistent to the scores given on these. Do you agree to the comment? How do the authors respond?

The review format for CoRL and other conferences differs each year slightly. For your information, below I describe what I'd consider a default review structure.

1.1 For your info: Typical structure of a review

The details of review forms vary for each conference/journal. But the core criterial (*originality, quality, significance, and clarity*) are typically somehow rated. The following are instructures to write a review with default structure:

- Summarize briefly the paper's general aim/motivation, theory/methods contributions, and results. (1 paragraph with about 10 lines.)
- Major comments (or "Strengths & Weaknesses"): This is the main part of the review. "Comment" here means, your own subjective view and opinion on a specific part/aspect of the paper. Comments can be positive or negative, and thereby explain your eventual rating of *originality, quality, significance, and clarity* of the paper. Here is what these four criteria mean:
  - Originality: Does the paper make significant novel contributions? What are they exactly in your opinion? Is the related work discussed well, and made clear how the proposed methods go beyond related work?
  - Quality: Are the novel contributions (methods or theory) done really well, or is it all just a hack. E.g., are the methods derived rigorously from first principles, is the approach general, clean and sound?
  - Significance: Are the results significant, i.e., does the method perform significantly better than previous work? Are the contributions an advancement to the field? Will you espect the paper to have significant impact on future research?
  - Clarity: Is the paper well written and things clearly explained?

  Each major comment typically picks out a certain part/aspect of the paper, that the reviewer believes is exceptionally strong or criticizes w.r.t. one of these four criteria. Also mention if the reviewer believes the authors could/should have been approached something differently. (Each major comment is typically a paragraph, sometimes longer.) Ideally all four criteria are covered by comments.
- Minor comments: Minor comments are smaller technical comments, which are not relevant for judging (accept/reject) the paper. This typically lists typos and minor errors in equations, suggestions to improve writing, or suggested fixes in notation. Each minor comment is often just one or a few lines.
- Numerical scores: Reviews typically also include numerical scores that reflect the rating of originality, quality, significance, and clarity. And based on that an overall rating/recommendation of accept or reject.