

## ICON 2020 Review Form – Submission xx

<b>Submission #xx:</b>	<b>Reviewer:</b>  <b>Secondary Reviewer:</b>
------------------------	--

1. In-Depth Review The answers to the following questions are mandatory, and will be shared with both the committee and the authors.

### **What is this paper about, and what contributions does it make?**

Please describe what problem or question this paper addresses, and the main contributions that it makes towards a solution or answer.

*Ans:*

### **What strengths does this paper have?**

Please describe the main strengths you see in the paper or the work it describes, regardless of whether you recommend this paper be accepted or not.

*Ans:*

### **What weaknesses does this paper have?**

Please describe any weaknesses you see in the paper or the work it describes, regardless of whether you recommend this paper be accepted or not.

*Ans:*

## Overall Recommendation

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<p><b>Overall Recommendation</b></p> <p>Do you think this paper should be accepted to the conference? In making your overall recommendation, please take into account all of the paper's strengths and weaknesses. Please rank short papers relative to other short papers, and long papers relative to other long papers. Acceptable short submissions include: small, focused contributions; works in progress; negative results and opinion pieces; and interesting application notes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 5 = Exciting: I would fight for this paper to be accepted.</li><li>• 4 = Strong: I would like to see it accepted.</li><li>• 3 = Borderline: It has some merits but also some serious problems. I'm ambivalent about this one.</li><li>• 2 = Mediocre: I would rather not see it in the conference.</li><li>• 1 = Poor: I would fight to have it rejected.</li></ul>	<p>Give a score between 1 to 5 (possible scores: 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5)</p>

---

2. Questions and Feedback for the Author(s) The answers to the following questions are optional. They will be shared with both the committee and the authors, but are primarily for the authors.

### **Questions for the Author(s)**

Please write any questions you have for the author(s) that you would like answers for in the author response (which you should take into account in your final review).

*Ans:*

### **Missing References**

Please list any references that should be included in the bibliography or need to be discussed in more depth.

*Ans:*

### **Presentation Improvements**

If there is anything in the paper that you found difficult to follow, please suggest how it could be better organized, motivated, or explained.

*Ans:*

### **Typos, Grammar, and Style**

Please list any typographical or grammatical errors, as well as any stylistic issues that should be improved.

*Ans:*

---

3. Confidential Information The answers to the following questions will be shared with the committee only, not the authors.

#### Recommendation for Oral Presentation

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<b>Recommendation for Oral Presentation</b> We have fewer slots for oral presentations (talks) than for posters, and want to make sure that the most appropriate papers get selected for talks. Note that the published proceedings will make no distinction between papers presented orally and those presented as posters. Would this paper make for a good talk (rather than a poster)?	Yes or No

#### Recommendations for Awards

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<b>Recommendation for Best Paper Award</b> Do you think this paper should be considered for a Best Paper Award? There will be separate Best Paper Awards for long and for short papers.	Yes or No
<b>Recommendation for Best Data Set or Resource Paper Award</b> Do you think this paper should be considered for a Best Data Set or Resource Award? The data set or resource must be publicly available in order to be eligible. It does not need to be submitted with the paper.	Yes or No

#### Justification for Best Paper Award Recommendations

Please describe briefly why you think this paper should receive an award. Your comments will not be shared with the authors, but if the paper receives an award, it is possible that some of your comments may be made public (but remain anonymous) in the award citation.

Ans:

### Reviewer Confidence

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<p><b>Reviewer Confidence</b></p> <p>How confident are you in your assessment of this paper?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 5 = Positive that my evaluation is correct. I read the paper very carefully and I am very familiar with related work.</li><li>• 4 = Quite sure. I tried to check the important points carefully. It's unlikely, though conceivable, that I missed something that should affect my ratings.</li><li>• 3 = Pretty sure, but there's a chance I missed something. Although I have a good feel for this area in general, I did not carefully check the paper's details, e.g., the math, experimental design, or novelty.</li><li>• 2 = Willing to defend my evaluation, but it is fairly likely that I missed some details, didn't understand some central points, or can't be sure about the novelty of the work.</li><li>• 1 = Not my area, or paper was hard for me to understand. My evaluation is just an educated guess.</li></ul>	<p>Give a score between 1 to 5 (possible scores: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</p>

### Confidential Comments to the Area Chairs/PC chairs

Is there anything you want to say solely to the committee?

For example, a very strong (negative) opinion on the paper, which might offend the authors in some way, or something which would expose your identity to the authors.

Ans: