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

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=x7S1NsUdKZ>

**Meta-review:**

This was a boredline paper.\nHowever, the reviewers like it, and it seems that the authors answered all the concerns of Reviewer LiPB and myself.\nPlease add the comparison of IDS and ENS to the final version.\n

**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** |
| --- | --- |
| This was a boredline paper. | Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field |
| the reviewers like it, and it seems that the authors answered all the concerns of Reviewer LiPB and myself. | Information from the full paper (excluding abstract) |

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

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=n5ej38Vfuup>

**Meta-review:**

This paper presents an interesting method dubbed quotient manifold modeling to handle the \"multi-manifold\" structure of natural data and generalize to new manifolds that arise from novel discrete combinations. While some of the methods and ideas were appreciated by reviewers, there were a number of experimental and clarity concerns. The authors's did not submit a rebuttal, and the many unaddressed concerns (especially around experimental baselines) lead me to recommend rejecting this work.

**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 a number of experimental and clarity concerns. | Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field |
| The authors's did not submit a rebuttal, and the many unaddressed concerns (especially around experimental baselines) lead me to recommend rejecting this work. | Information from the full paper (excluding abstract) |

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

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=GtiDFD1pxpz>

**Meta-review:**

This paper was reviewed by 4 reviewers who scored the paper below acceptance threshold even after the rebuttal. Reviewer 4 is concerned about motivation, Reviewer 2 rightly points out that there exist numerous works that use some form of spectral layers in a deep setting on challenging datasets - something lacking in this work. Reviewer 3 is concerned about limited discussion on lie groups and the overall benefit of expm(.). Reviewer 1 reverberates the same comments regarding insufficient experiments, comparisons and limited motivation. We encourage authors to consider all pointers given by reviewers in any future re-submission.

**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** |
| --- | --- |
| We encourage authors to consider all pointers given by reviewers in any future re-submission. | Other |

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

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=bYIddUC7AYO>

**Meta-review:**

The paper's main contribution is to provide a crisp theoretical characterization of the feasibility of detecting multiplicity of underlying communities in a degree-corrected mixed membership hypergraph model. \n\nIt has been recognized by all reviews that this is a significant achievement that will be of interest to researchers working on stochastic block models and related inference questions. The reviewers did not give very high marks on the basis that the topic may be of interest to only a limited subset of the NeurIPS community, also pointing to the fact that the paper could be made more attractive if a compelling application was brought forward. \n\nThe authors' reply to these comments is an argument that the problem they tackle is important in network science, an area which is relevant for NeurIPS, and a description of concrete applications to hypergraphs of co-authorships in scientific articles. The authors further point to the usefulness of their result to hierarchical clustering, and explain in greater detail how their non-polynomial time test informs the design of the polynomial test used in the experiments. \n\nI believe that these answers by the authors alleviate the concerns expressed by the reviewers, and suffice to justify acceptance of the paper to the conference. \n\n\n\n\n\n

**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 5 ###**

**Source Documents:**

Link to OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=tkra4vFiFq>

**Meta-review:**

While all reviewers agree the problem of TEEs for model training is well motivated, the reviewers remain divided on whether the concept of randomly selecting computations to verify has sufficient novelty, and whether the proposed gradient clipping method is well motivated.\n

**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=rkg8xTEtvB>

**Meta-review:**

The authors propose a new method for learning hierarchically disentangled representations. One reviewer is positive, one is between weak accept and borderline and two reviewers recommend rejection, and keep their assessment after rebuttal and a discussion. The main criticism is the lack of disentanglement metrics and comparisons. After reading the paper and the discussion, the AC tends to agree with the negative reviewers. Authors are encouraged to strengthen their work and resubmit to a future venue.

**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 AC tends to agree with the negative reviewers. Authors are encouraged to strengthen their work and resubmit to a future venue. | Meta-reviewer's knowledge in the field |