

# ML4B 2021 Conference - paper review

Please make sure you have read the guidelines thoroughly before completing this survey.

You can read the guidelines at: <https://bit.ly/3uflJWF>

**\*Required**

1. Email \*

---

2. First name of the reviewer \*

---

3. Title of the Paper you are reviewing \*

Be sure to enter the full title, as some papers have similar names.

---

---

---

---

---

## 1. Paper Ranking

The questions in this section of the evaluation pertain to the paper overall and the reviewer's confidence. Please keep these items in mind when reading through the paper.

### 4. Overall Evaluation \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 3 (strong accept)
- ☐ 2 (accept)
- ☐ 1 (borderline paper, but has merits that outweigh flaws)
- ☐ -1 (borderline paper, but the flaws may outweigh the merits)
- ☐ -2 (reject)
- ☐ -3 (strong reject)

## 5. Reviewer's Confidence \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 3 (I am very confident in my evaluation of the paper. I read the paper very carefully and I am very familiar with related work.)
- ☐ 2 (I tried to check the important points carefully. It is unlikely, though possible, that I missed something that could affect my ratings.)
- ☐ 1 (I am 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.)
- ☐ 0 (Not my area, or the paper was hard for me to understand.)

### 2. Questionnaire

This portion refers to the technical content of the paper and although there is no simple formula for what is acceptable content, there are some basic questions you have to apply.

## 6. Relevance \*

First and foremost, it should be considered whether or not the submission fits the objectives of the ML4B 2021 Conference.

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 2 (high)
- ☐ 1 (adequate)
- ☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)
- ☐ -2 (lacking completely)

## 7. Abstract \*

Does it clearly convey the meaning of the paper?

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 2 (high)
- ☐ 1 (adequate)
- ☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)
- ☐ -2 (lacking completely)

8. Subject material \*

Is it timely and will likely draw an audience?

*Mark only one oval.*

☐ 2 (high)

☐ 1 (adequate)

☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)

☐ -2 (lacking completely)

9. Organization \*

Is the paper well organized and is the material clearly presented?

*Mark only one oval.*

☐ 2 (high)

☐ 1 (adequate)

☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)

☐ -2 (lacking completely)

10. Figures and tables \*

Are figures and tables of suitable quality and clarity and enhance the understanding of the information being presented?

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 2 (high)
- ☐ 1 (adequate)
- ☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)
- ☐ -2 (lacking completely)
- ☐ This paper contains no figures or tables.

11. Conclusions \*

Do they follow logically from the text and are supported by the information presented?

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 2 (high)
- ☐ 1 (adequate)
- ☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)
- ☐ -2 (lacking completely)

## 12. Quality of English language \*

Is text edited to acceptable standards, i.e., proper grammar, spelling, etc.?

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 2 (high)
- ☐ 1 (adequate)
- ☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)
- ☐ -2 (lacking completely)

## 13. Formal consistency \*

Are references, symbols and units being used consistently throughout the paper?

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 2 (high)
- ☐ 1 (adequate)
- ☐ -1 (below the acceptable threshold)
- ☐ -2 (lacking completely)

### 3. Remarks

There is no simple formula for valuable remarks. However, general requirements that should be considered during paper reviews are provided below.

#### 14. Summary \*

Please summarize the main claim(s) of this paper in two or three sentences.

---

---

---

---

---

#### 15. Detailed review \*

Please provide a detailed review, including justification for your scores, the degree to which the paper substantiates its main claims and the degree to which the results in the paper are reproducible.

---

---

---

---

---



## 16. Recommendations \*

Your evaluation should include detailed comments to the authors describing any shortcomings of the paper and recommending changes that will address these shortcomings. The very best reviews include suggestions and pointers to related work.

---

---

---

---

---

## 17. Confidential comments to conference chairs

Use this section to write any comments that only the chairs will see.

---

---

---

---

---

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms