

# Conference Paper Reviewer Guidelines

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for a ML4B Conference. Following are guidelines and criteria to be taken into consideration as you evaluate a paper. Your recommendations will be used by the conference chairs to make a final decision. The conference chairs will decide on whether or not the paper will be published in the conference proceedings.

Your comments/remarks will be provided to the authors anonymously so they can properly modify their paper for publication. All papers will have four reviews performed for the chairs' consideration.

## Purpose of Review

The primary purpose of your review is to improve the technical quality of the submission and provide a recommendation on whether the paper would make an interesting conference presentation so that a high quality program can be developed.

## Review Process

You will receive a direct message providing the list of papers to which you have been assigned and links to the corresponding survey which will act as your review. A deadline will be provided in your instructions.

Authors amendments to their papers are to be performed within a certain period after which you will receive a second direct message. You may adjust your evaluation according to the changes made by the authors. Once more, a deadline will be provided in your instructions.

You should pay serious attention to whether or not the speaker has the ability to deliver an engaging conference presentation.

In the survey, you will find a rating form which allows you to rank the paper by assigning a value to overall criteria. In addition, we have provided a list of review criteria to answer (see point 2 of this document). Finally, the survey includes space for you to leave remarks to the authors and the conference chair. Your ranking and comments to the authors are the only information visible to the authors, therefore granting you anonymity.

## Paper Evaluation

There are three components to your paper review: (1) paper ranking (2) questionnaire (3) remarks. All components should be considered when reviewing the paper.

### 1. Paper Ranking

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

#### Overall Evaluation

Score	Description
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

#### Reviewer's Confidence

Score	Description
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 acceptable content is, there are some basic questions you have to apply.

Criteria	Description
Relevance	First and foremost, it should be considered whether or not the submission fits the objectives of the ML4B 2021 Conference.
Abstract	Does it clearly convey the meaning of the paper?
Subject material	Is it timely and will likely draw an audience?
Organization	Is the paper well organized and is the material clearly presented?
Figures and tables	Are figures and tables of suitable quality and clarity and enhance the understanding of the information being presented?
Conclusions	Do they follow logically from the text and are supported by the information presented?
Quality of English language	Is text edited to acceptable standards, i.e., proper grammar, spelling, etc.?
Formal consistency	Are references, symbols and units being used consistently throughout the paper?

### 3. Remarks

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

Criteria	Description
Summary	Please summarize the main claim(s) of this paper in two or three sentences.
Detailed review	Please provide a detailed review, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Justification for your scores.</li><li>- The degree to which the paper substantiates its main claims.</li><li>- The degree to which the results in the paper are reproducible.</li></ul>
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.
Confidential comments to conference chairs	Use this section to write any comments that only the chairs will see.