Review Form

This year, the 23rd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR) will take place in a hybrid format from Dec 4-8, 2022 and will be hosted in Bengaluru, India. Please visit https://ismir2022.ismir.net for more information.

The reviewing process is critical to the success of ISMIR, as it helps guarantee a high scientific quality for our conference.

The main tasks for a reviewer will be as follows:
1. Submit your domain conflicts, your subject areas, and eventually bid on papers you are best qualified to review.
2. With the review guidelines in mind, carefully read 3-4 papers and write a review with your own opinion about the papers before going into the discussion phase.
3. Each paper will be reviewed by three reviewers and a meta-reviewer.
4. Participate in the discussion phase through the review system, so that you and the other reviewers try to come to an agreement.
5. If applicable, update your reviews following the discussion with the other reviewers.

We expect this work to take place between mid May and late June, with the discussion phase occurring between Jun 17 - Jun 24, 2022. As you can see, being a reviewer will bring a fair amount of work, but ISMIR greatly appreciates your reliability and dedication, and your work is essential to the success of ISMIR.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. I have read the reviewer guidelines (https://ismir.net/reviewer-guidelines) * *(visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- Yes
- No

2. I am an expert on the topic of the paper. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

3. Does this submission relate to the topics mentioned in the Special Call for Papers on Cultural and Social Diversity in MIR? Please refer to the Call For Papers - Special Call section regarding the scope of this special call. Please also take into account the

intention of the authors by checking the "Special Call" column in the Reviewer Console. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Yes
- o No

4. The title and abstract reflect the content of the paper. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

5. The paper discusses, cites and compares with all relevant related work * *(visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

6. Please justify the previous choice (Required if "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" is chosen) *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

8000 characters left

7. Readability and paper organization: The writing and language are clear and structured in a logical manner. * *(visible to authors during feedback, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

8. The paper adheres to ISMIR 2022 submission guidelines (uses the ISMIR 2022 template, has at most 6 pages of technical content followed by "n" pages of references, references are well formatted).

If you selected "No", please explain the issue in your comments.
** *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Yes
- o No

9. Relevance of the topic to ISMIR: The topic of the paper is relevant to the ISMIR community.
Note that submissions of novel music-related topics, tasks, and applications are highly encouraged. If you think that the paper has merit but does not exactly match the topics of ISMIR, please do not simply reject the paper but instead communicate this to the Program Committee Chairs. Please do not penalize the paper when the proposed method can also be applied to non-music domains if it is shown to be useful in music domains. ** *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

10. Scholarly/scientific quality: The content is scientifically correct.
** *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

11. Please justify the previous choice (Required if "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" is chosen) *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

8000 characters left

12. Novelty of the paper: The paper provides novel methods, applications, findings or results.
Please do not narrowly view "novelty" as only new methods or theories. Papers proposing novel musical applications of existing methods from other research fields are considered novel at ISMIR conferences. ** *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

13. The paper provides all the necessary details or material to reproduce the results described in the paper. Keep in mind that ISMIR respects the diversity of academic disciplines, backgrounds, and approaches. Although ISMIR has a tradition of publishing open datasets and open-source projects to enhance the scientific reproducibility, ISMIR accepts submissions using proprietary datasets and implementations that are not sharable. Please do not simply reject the paper when proprietary datasets or implementations are used. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

14. Pioneering proposals: This paper proposes a novel topic, task or application. Since this is intended to encourage brave new ideas and challenges, papers rated "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" can be highlighted, but please do not penalize papers rated "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree". Keep in mind that it is often difficult to provide baseline comparisons for novel topics, tasks, or applications. If you think that the novelty is high but the evaluation is weak, please do not simply reject the paper but carefully assess the value of the paper for the community. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree (Well-explored topic, task, or application)
- o Disagree (Standard topic, task, or application)
- o Agree (Novel topic, task, or application)
- o Strongly agree (Very novel topic, task, or application)

15. Reusable insights: The paper provides reusable insights (i.e. the capacity to gain an accurate and deep understanding).
Such insights may go beyond the scope of the paper, domain or application, in order to build up consistent knowledge across the MIR community. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

16. Please explain your assessment of reusable insights in the paper. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

8000 characters left

17. Write ONE line (in your own words) with the main take-home message from the paper. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

8000 characters left

18. This paper is of award-winning quality. * *(visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Yes
- o No

19. If yes, please explain why it should be awarded. *(visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

8000 characters left

20. Potential to generate discourse: The paper will generate discourse at the ISMIR conference or have a large influence/impact on the future of the ISMIR community. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strongly disagree
- o Disagree
- o Agree
- o Strongly agree

21. Overall evaluation: Keep in mind that minor flaws can be corrected, and should not be a reason to reject a paper. Please familiarize yourself with the reviewer guidelines at https://ismir.net/reviewer-guidelines * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

- o Strong reject
- o Weak reject
- o Weak accept
- o Strong accept

22. Main review and comments for the authors. Please summarize strengths and weaknesses of the paper. It is essential that you justify the reason for the overall evaluation score in detail. Keep in mind that belittling or sarcastic comments are not appropriate. * *(visible to authors after notification, visible to other reviewers, visible to meta-reviewers)*

8000 characters left

23. Confidential comments for the program committee *(not visible to authors).* *(visible to meta-reviewers)*

8000 characters left