Dear {FirstName},

This email gives detailed instructions to help you write your AAMAS-2015 reviews. We hope you have checked the set of papers you were asked to review. If there are any problems with the allocation and you have not informed us yet, please do so as soon as possible.

We have enabled the review form so you can now enter the reviews of the papers that have been assigned to you. Please remember that the STRICT deadline for doing so is

FRIDAY 9th of JANUARY 2015, 23:59 UTC-12.

However, why not make a note in your diary to finish the reviews before the Christmas break? Would it not be great to start the New Year without having to worry about the (exceptional) AAMAS review deadline in early January?

We have made a few changes to the review form compared to previous years.
Therefore, please read these instructions even if you have served on AAMAS Program Committee in the past. To access the review form, after logging in to ConfMaster, click on "View Assigned Papers" under the "PC Member" menu on the left-hand panel. You will then see the list of papers assigned to you. To enter the review for a particular paper, click on the R circle that appears towards the right-hand side of the line for that paper.

In the review form, you are asked to evaluate each paper based on the following criteria: (1) relevance, (2) originality and novelty, (3) significance, (4) readability and organisation, and (5) technical quality and soundness. For each category, you have to select a score between 1 and 10. Based on these scores, you are asked to provide an overall mark for acceptance as a full paper as well as an overall mark for acceptance as an extended abstract. To give you a sense of what the marks for those 5 criteria above and the two overall marks are expected to mean, you can use the guidelines that we included at the end of this email.

In contrast to previous years, instead of reporting one mark for your confidence in your review, this year you are asked to report two separate numbers: one for your expertise (e.g., your familiarity with the area that the paper belongs to) and another for your thoroughness in reviewing (how carefully you have read the paper). As a rough guideline, we propose the following interpretation of the numerical scores for those two criteria:

Expertise

 1: I am not familiar with this area.

 3: I have a passing familiarity with the area of the paper (have seen
    a talk on this topic, have glanced at a few papers).

 5: I am somewhat familiar with this area (have read a few papers, have
    seen a tutorial or a mini-course, work on related topics).

 7: I work in this area, though not on this specific topic.

 9: I work on this topic and understand the area well; I could have
    written this paper.

10: I know this topic at least as well as the authors; I should have
    written this paper!

Thoroughness

 1: I have read the title of the paper.

 2: I have read the title and abstract of the paper.

 3: I have read the title, abstract and introduction.

 4: I have read the title, abstract, introduction and
    conclusions, and quickly skimmed through the rest of the paper.

 5: I have read the title, abstract, introduction, conclusions, and
    looked at the main results.

 6: I have read the title, abstract, introduction, conclusions, as
    well as all definitions and the statements of all results.

 7: I have read the whole paper but only checked carefully a few of the
    proofs/experiments.

 8: I have read the paper and checked most of the results,
    except possibly a few of the most technical ones.

 9: I have read the paper and attempted to check all of the results,
    although on some occasions I got stuck.

10: I have verified all results; the full list of bugs, typos and
    stylistic errors is included in the review.

We suggest that you structure your review as follows (the structure also appears in the template that is included in the review form; please
keep these section headings for the review structure). Start with a brief description of the paper, followed by a justification for all the scores you gave to the paper (for each of the 5 main evaluation criteria listed above). You can then provide detailed feedback to the authors (typos, minor corrections, pointers to related work, etc.). If there are specific questions that you would like the authors to address during the rebuttal stage, please list them at the end of your review.

Your review will be seen by the Senior Program Committee members and the other Program Committee members assigned to this paper, as well as the authors; if you want to include confidential comments (which will be seen by the SPC and other PCs, but not the authors), please use the "Confidential Comments to PC Members" box. In particular, if you have used the help of a subreviewer to prepare your report, please indicate their name in that box. Finally, in the last box, please provide a quick summary of your review.

IMPORTANT: If you would like to write as part of your review whether you think the paper should be rejected or accepted, please do so in the box "Comments to SPC member" so that only the SPC and other fellow reviewers of that paper can see your recommendation. Please do NOT write acceptance/rejection recommendations in the boxes that authors can read (i.e., "comments to authors" and "summary of review"). There will be plenty of room for acceptance/rejection recommendations during the discussion (which the authors cannot read).

When writing the parts of your review that will be seen by the authors, please be professional and courteous. In particular, please make sure all the comments you write are phrased in a constructive manner: in all cases the authors should perceive the review as an earnest attempt of the reviewer to help the authors improve their paper.

Best wishes,

Rafael Bordini and Edith Elkind
AAMAS-2015 Programme Chairs

==========

Relevance

1: The paper is of no interest to the AAMAS audience.

3: The paper is mostly out of scope for AAMAS, but could be of
   interest to a small group of attendees.

5: The paper is marginally in scope for AAMAS.

7: The paper is in scope for AAMAS, it will interest one the various
   communities that attend the AAMAS conference.

9: The area of the paper is well-represented at AAMAS, and the paper
   is well targeted for the AAMAS audience.

10: The paper will interest every single attendant of AAMAS.

Originality

1: The paper reports results that were already known.

3: A straightforward extension of earlier work which uses standard
   tools and produces unsurprising results.

5: A new research question, the solution uses standard techniques,
but
   their application is not entirely trivial.

7: A new research question that requires new technical insights
   and/or produces surprising results.

9: A research question that suggests an exciting new research
direction and/or
   an interesting new technique.

10: A breakthrough contribution that opens up new horizons for AAMAS.

Significance

1: The paper has no technical contribution whatsoever.

3: The contribution of the paper is unlikely to have any impact.

5: The results will be of interest to a few researchers who work on
   those topics.

 7: The results will be of interest to a large group of researchers in
    that area.

 9: The results will have impact beyond the subarea that the paper
    belongs to.

10: The paper will change our view of the entire research area.

Readability and Organisation

 1: The paper fails basic rules of academic writing, or the authors
    have a very limited command of the English language.

 3: The paper is badly written/organised; it would be embarrassing to
    publish it in its current form.

 5: The quality of writing is tolerable but not great; another
    round of proofreading must be done before publication.

 7: The paper is mostly readable, but contains a few typos/confusing
    notation/unclear arguments that can be easily fixed.

 9: The paper is extremely well written and organised and all the
    results are clearly explained; there are only very few typos to be
    fixed.

10: The paper is a pleasure to read -- all proofs are easy to follow /
    the experimental results are well presented, the authors have
    included useful figures where needed, the grammar is perfect, and
    there are no typos.

Technical Quality and Soundness

 1: All the technical details of the paper are trivial or incorrect.

 3: Much of the technical details are unsound or trivial.

 5: There are some non-trivial, sound technical details, but there
    remain technical problems that are not easy to fix.

 7: The technical details have depth but there remains some minor
    technical problems; the authors should be able to fix those
easily.

 9: The work has great technical depth and the results are sound.

10: The paper is flawless and contains some of the most brilliant
    technical results I have read in a conference paper.

Overall Recommendation (Full Paper)

 1: The paper is obviously not suitable for AAMAS.

 2: I strongly support rejection; it will be embarrassing to accept
    this paper.

 3: I strongly support rejection, and will argue against accepting
    this paper.

 4: I support rejection.

 5: I weakly support rejection; I will not be too upset if the paper
    is accepted.

 6: I weakly support acceptance; I will not be too upset if the
    paper is rejected.

 7: I support acceptance.

 8: This paper is likely to be among top 50% of accepted papers, I
    strongly support acceptance.

 9: This paper is likely to be among top 10% of accepted papers,
    possibly best paper material.

10: This paper is better than any AAMAS paper I have seen.

Overall Recommendation (Extended Abstract)

NB: These scores will only be considered once it has been decided that
the paper should not be accepted as a full paper. Thus, even if you
support accepting the paper as full, choose a score for acceptance as
an extended abstract under the assumption that your fellow PCs and SPC
prefer not to accept this paper as full. Supporting a paper for full
acceptance does not imply that you should support it as an extended
abstract. Papers for poster presentations should have exciting new
ideas that will lead to lively discussion, and you should consider
also whether the main contributions of the paper can be adequately

summarised in two pages.

 1: There is not a single interesting idea in this paper; there is
    nothing in it to discuss at the poster session.

 3: The paper is not a good fit for the poster session
    (the results are weak or not suitable for poster
    presentation, or cannot be adequately written in two pages).

 5: Some interesting new ideas, but perhaps not quite
    enough for a venue like AAMAS.

 7: The paper has interesting ideas worth publishing as an extended
    abstract; some members of the community will definitely be
    interested in discussing thise ideas at the poster session.

 9: The material in the paper will make an excellent poster
presentation.

10: Brilliant new ideas that can be adequately summarised in
    two pages; everyone would love to hear the authors at the poster
    session.