**### Task 1 ###**

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Arn2E4IRjEB>

**Meta-review:**

After an extensive back-and-forth discussion, all reviewers felt positively about the paper and its contribution, and lean towards acceptance.\n\nHowever, there were issues regarding clarity in the submitted draft — this has been largely addressed through clarifications from the authors, but it is essential that the discussion here is incorporated into the final version of the manuscript (and in particular, the responses to reviewer 1AuD).

**Statements that draw on external knowledge:**

Possible sources:

1. Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field

2. Information from the full paper (excluding abstract)

3. Knowledge from related publications

4. Other

Please feel free to add more rows to the table.

| **Text span** | **Possible source** |
| --- | --- |
| there were issues regarding clarity in the submitted draft | Information from the full paper |

**### Task 2 ###**

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SJgmR0NKPr>

**Meta-review:**

The paper proposes an alternative to BPTT for training recurrent neural networks based on an explicit state variable, which is trained to improve both the prediction accuracy and the prediction of the next state. One of the benefits of the methods is that it can be used for online training, where BPTT cannot be used in its exact form. Theoretical analysis is developed to show that the algorithm converges to a fixed point. Overall, the reviewers appreciate the clarity of the paper, and find the theory and the experimental evaluation to be reasonably well balanced. After a round of discussion, the authors improved the paper according to the reviews. The final assessments are overall positive, and I’m therefore recommending accepting this paper.

**Statements that draw on external knowledge:**

Possible sources:

1. Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field

2. Information from the full paper (excluding abstract)

3. Knowledge from related publications

4. Other

Please feel free to add more rows to the table.

| **Text span** | **Possible source** |
| --- | --- |
| trained to improve both the prediction accuracy and the prediction of the next state | Information from the full paper |
| where BPTT cannot be used in its exact form | Information from the full paper |
| the theory and the experimental evaluation to be reasonably well balanced. | Information from the full paper, Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field |

**### Task 3 ###**

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=cu7IUiOhujH>

**Meta-review:**

This paper introduces supervised contrastive learning loss on top of typical cross-entropy loss for fine-tuning language model for downstream tasks. While the idea is simple and has been used in vision literature (as pointed out by R1 & R4), its application LM is first introduced in this paper. The experimental gain is small in the regular setting but clearer gains in a few-shot learning setting and noisy training dataset (through back translation) setting. Overall the paper is clearly written and experiments are carefully studied. During the discussion phase, the authors provided results on the full GLUE dataset as well as other ablation studies (e.g., CE+CE recommended by R2), improving the paper.

**Statements that draw on external knowledge:**

Possible sources:

1. Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field

2. Information from the full paper (excluding abstract)

3. Knowledge from related publications

4. Other

Please feel free to add more rows to the table.

| **Text span** | **Possible source** |
| --- | --- |
| The experimental gain is small in the regular setting but clearer gains in a few-shot learning setting and noisy training dataset | Information from the full paper |
| the paper is clearly written and experiments are carefully studied | Information from the full paper |

**### Task 4 ###**

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ryenvpEKDr>

**Meta-review:**

The paper presents a very interesting idea for estimating the held-out error of deep models as a function of model and data set size. The authors intuit what the shape of the error should be, then they fit the parameters of a function of the desired shape and show that this has predictive power. I find this idea quite refreshing and the paper is well written with good experiments. Please make sure that the final version contains the cross-validation results provided during the rebuttal.

**Statements that draw on external knowledge:**

Possible sources:

1. Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field

2. Information from the full paper (excluding abstract)

3. Knowledge from related publications

4. Other

Please feel free to add more rows to the table.

| **Text span** | **Possible source** |
| --- | --- |
| intuit what the shape of the error should be, then they fit the parameters of a function of the desired shape | Information from the full paper |
| I find this idea quite refreshing | Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field |

**### Task 5 ###**

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=f9AIc3mEprf>

**Meta-review:**

This paper introduces an ImageNet-scale benchmark UIMNET for uncertainty estimation of deep image classifiers and evaluates prior works under the proposed benchmark. Two reviewers suggest reject, and one reviewer does acceptance. In the discussion period, the authors did not provide any response for many concerns of reviewers, e.g., weak baselines, weak novelty, and lack of justification for the current design. Hence, given the current status, AC recommends reject.

**Statements that draw on external knowledge:**

Possible sources:

1. Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field

2. Information from the full paper (excluding abstract)

3. Knowledge from related publications

4. Other

Please feel free to add more rows to the table.

| **Text span** | **Possible source** |
| --- | --- |
| (Remove this text when you need to fill the table. If there is no text span to highlight, please keep this and highlight this line of text.) |  |

**### Task 6 ###**

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wZYWwJvkneF>

**Meta-review:**

This paper generated an involved discussion between the reviewers and the authors, as well as between the reviewers themselves.\nThe paper essentially combines two well-known baselines in MARL domain, and therefore was judged as a report of experiments for which reproducibility is of particular importance. The reviewers had an intense discussion about reproducibility, two of them tried the code provided by the authors and one of them commented on it based on their experience. The analysis raised significant doubts about reproducibility (it is unfortunate that the authors did not provide configs on their experiments, to enable to rerun them exactly).

**Statements that draw on external knowledge:**

Possible sources:

1. Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field

2. Information from the full paper (excluding abstract)

3. Knowledge from related publications

4. Other

Please feel free to add more rows to the table.­

| **Text span** | **Possible source** |
| --- | --- |
| two well-known baselines in MARL domain, and therefore was judged as a report of experiments for which reproducibility is of particular importance | Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field |