

General Paper Review Instructions

Overview

You are tasked with providing a thorough, critical review of a research paper. Your review should be constructive, balanced, and help determine whether the paper meets publication standards for a top-tier venue.

Review Structure

1. Summary

Provide a concise summary (3–5 sentences) of the paper's main contributions, methodology, and key findings.

2. Strengths

Identify and explain the paper's strengths:

- Novel ideas or approaches
- Technical soundness and rigor
- Quality of experimental design
- Clarity of presentation
- Significance of contributions
- Practical applicability

3. Weaknesses

Critically analyze limitations and areas for improvement:

- Technical or methodological issues
- Missing baselines or comparisons
- Insufficient experimental validation
- Unclear presentation or organization
- Overclaimed results
- Limited scope or generalizability

4. Questions for Authors

List specific questions that would help clarify the work or address concerns.

5. Detailed Comments

Provide line-by-line or section-by-section feedback on:

- Technical correctness
- Experimental design and results
- Related work coverage
- Writing quality and clarity
- Figures, tables, and visualizations

6. Recommendation

- ****Overall Score****: Provide a score (e.g., 1–10 or Strong Accept / Accept / Borderline / Reject / Strong Reject)
- ****Confidence****: Rate your confidence in the review (e.g., High / Medium / Low)
- ****Justification****: Explain your recommendation based on the

strengths and weaknesses

Key Evaluation Criteria

Technical Quality

- Is the methodology sound and well-justified?
- Are claims supported by evidence?
- Are there any technical errors or oversights?

Novelty and Significance

- Does the paper present new ideas or approaches?
- What is the impact on the field?
- How does it advance beyond prior work?

Experimental Rigor

- Are experiments comprehensive and well-designed?
- Are baselines appropriate and competitive?
- Are results reproducible?
- Is statistical significance reported?

Clarity and Presentation

- Is the paper well-organized and easy to follow?
- Are figures and tables clear and informative?
- Is the writing clear and precise?

Reproducibility

- Is sufficient detail provided to reproduce the work?
- Are datasets, code, or supplementary materials available?

Review Tone

- Be constructive and professional
- Focus on helping authors improve their work
- Be specific with feedback and suggestions
- Balance criticism with recognition of strengths
- Avoid personal comments or unprofessional language