You are given a peer review of a research paper submitted to a scientific journal. Your task is to evaluate the review against a checklist and note where the review fails.

Here are step-by-step instructions:

1. Read the text of the review.

2. Evaluate every comment in the review:

• Focus on comments related to weaknesses of the paper or questions the reviewer has. Ignore any comments that are summaries of the paper or that discuss strengths of the paper.

• Consider the reviewer’s comments in their entirety. Make sure you read all sentences related to one thought, since the full context of the reviewer’s comment is very important.

• For each comment, evaluate it against the following checklist. Follow the examples for how to respond. Importantly, you should be as helpful as possible. Do no ask superficial questions or make superficial remarks, think deeply and exhibit your understanding.

• Most reviewer comments are already sufficiently clear and actionable. Only focus on the ones that clearly fail the checklist items below.

• Checklist:

(a) Look for any vague or unjustified claims in the review. This results in points that are not actionable or harder to respond to.

First, let us define what it means for a comment to be actionable and specific enough. There are a few pieces of criteria we will use to determine this:

i. The review comment specifies the section, paragraph, figure, or table where the issue occurs.

ii. The issue or concern in the review comment is explicitly stated, avoiding vague language.

iii. The comment explains why the identified issue is problematic and needs addressing.

iv. The reviewer provides concrete examples:

A. At least one example of what they find unclear or problematic.

B. At least one example or suggestion of what would address their concern (e.g.,

specific metrics, experiments, or changes).

Do NOT nitpick. Most comments are already specific and actionable, and we do not want to provide feedback on those.

The following are examples of reviewer comments that fail this checklist item.

∗ Reviewer comment: It appears that the linear mode connectivity results may be somewhat brittle.

∗ Reviewer comment: The paper writing is not fluent enough and needs polishing to be easier to follow.

∗ Reviewer comment: In the proposed method, an additional optimization problem is required to solve every iteration, i.e., Eq. (11). Thus the proposed method seems inefficient since it is a nested-loop algorithm.

Here are some examples of reviewer comments that are clear and specific, and therefore do not need feedback:

– Reviewer comment: 4) In Figure 6, Spearman rank correlation scores for HCMs are reported. As far as I know, Spearman rank correlation calculates the correlation between two variables. How was the correlation computed from multiple runs in this case?

– Reviewer comment: While there are detailed information about training procedure, not much is written about the actual inference step. For instance, how many samples for each prototype are required for reliable performance?

(b) Identify any personal attacks or inappropriate remarks made by the reviewer. This can be about the personality, the knowledge, or the experience of the authors. For example, they call the work “incompetent” without justifying why.

The following are examples of reviewer comments that fail this checklist item:

∗ Reviewer comment: The authors clearly do not live in the real world and do not care about people or downstream effects of their research.

∗ Reviewer comment: This paper is embarrassing, and you are clearly not fit to be in research.

∗ Reviewer comment: This MC-IS method for estimating the score will NEVER work well in high dimensions due to variance and thus why works such as [1,2,3,4] which are clearly aware of this formulation (as they either state it in their appendices or use it for subsequent calculation) pursue an optimization alternative to estimating the drift.

3. Start all your answers with yes, no, or partly; then always provide one sentence of reasoning for your answer.