ICBINB@NeurIPS 2020: Reviewer Guidelines

Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer for the ICBINB@NeurIPS 2020 workshop!

Please read the instructions for reviewing carefully, and do not hesitate to contact the organizers at cant.believe.it.is.not.better@gmail.com if you have any questions!

Best,

ICBINB@NeurIPS 2020 Organizers

Important Dates

October 20, 2020: Reviewing period begins
October 30, 2020: Reviewing period ends

General Guidelines

One of the main goals of the workshop is to provide an inclusive venue for researchers to present their work and get feedback from other researchers in the field. The spirit of the workshop is to evaluate works based on (1) their relevance to the probabilistic Machine Learning community (how surprising are the presented results), (2) the rigor/quality of the research process as opposed to the final performance of the presented approach, and (3) their likelihood of getting constructive feedback that helps the authors.
Papers will fall in one of the following two tracks (disclaimer: papers are not labeled, the reviewer must assess which track a submission belongs to):

Track 1: ``I Can't Believe It's Not Better!". In this track, we are interested in papers that describe an appealing idea, broadly in probabilistic ML, but are "stuck" at getting the idea to "work". One goal of this workshop is to help authors get "un-stuck". Another goal of this workshop is to surface negative results which highlight gaps between theory and practice and which may be interesting or revealing to the general community and prompt new lines of inquiry.

As a reviewer, you are being asked to judge whether a submission is:
1) Likely to benefit from being presented at the workshop (i.e., likely to get "un-stuck"), and/or
2) Likely to reveal a compelling gap between theory and practice.

A submission will ideally be both; however, we are interested in both kinds of papers.

Track 2: ``Questioning default practices". In this track, we are interested in papers that either present a novel set of techniques and good practices, or seek to popularize negative “folk wisdom” that is accessible within privileged circles but not to the wider community. Unlike for Track 1 submission, as a reviewer, we ask that you review the submission in a more conventional way, judging them for clarity, correctness, and novelty.

Reviewing criteria:

1. Summary and contributions: Briefly summarize the paper and its contributions.

2. Scope: Do the main ideas of the paper broadly fall under the scope of probabilistic machine learning?

3. Clarity: Is the paper well written? Does it describe the main ideas clearly?

4. Quality/Rigor: Is the empirical methodology correct? Are the claims in the paper convincing? Is the analysis thorough (e.g., via ablations of the method)?

5. Benefit to the paper (only for Track 1): Will the paper likely benefit from being presented at the workshop? Does it clearly explain how it is "stuck"? Is it likely that one or more expert attendees can provide tips or feedback to the authors that will get the paper to "work"?

6. Benefit to the community (both Tracks): Does the paper highlight a compelling gap between theory and practice that is likely to spark interest in the broader community?

7. Reproducibility: Are there enough details to reproduce the major results of this work?

8. Additional feedback: Comments/suggestions for improvement and questions for the authors

9. Overall score:

- **Strong accept [oral presentation]** (very likely to benefit from being presented, to benefit the community, and to un-stuck/open new interesting research directions)
- **Accept [spotlight]** (likely to benefit from being presented at the workshop AND likely to benefit the community)
- **Weak accept [poster]** (likely to benefit from being presented at the workshop OR likely to benefit the community)
- **Weak reject** (suffers from serious clarity issues, unlikely to benefit from being presented AND unlikely to benefit the community)
- **Strong reject** (clearly out of scope or incorrect)

10. Confidence:

- Absolutely certain about my score
- Confident but not absolutely certain
- Fairly confident
- Willing to defend the paper, but likely that the reviewer did not understand central parts in the paper
- Educated guess