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1. Summarize the (at most) 3 key main ideas.

2. State the main contribution of the paper

3. Critique the main contribution

3.a. Rate the *significance* of the paper on a scale of 5 (breakthrough), 4 (significant contribution), 3 (modest contribution), 2 (incremental contribution), 1 (no contribution or negative contribution). Explain your rating in a sentence or two.

3.b. Rate how *convincing* is the methodology: do the claims and conclusions follow from the experiments? Are the assumptions realistic? Are the experiments well designed? Are there different experiments that would be more convincing? Are there other alternatives the authors should have considered? (And, of course, is the paper free of methodological errors.)

3.c. What is the most important limitation of the approach?

4. Rate the writing in the paper on a scale of 5 (great) to 1 (bad), and justify your ranking.  Did you have to re-read sections?  Were algorithms clearly explained?  Did the paper have a logical flow?

5. Answer one of the following three questions (whichever is most relevant for this paper): What lessons should system researchers and builders take away from this work? What is the lasting impact of this work? What (if any) questions does this work leave open?

6. What did you fail to understand about the paper? Did you ignore certain parts? Any questions left?