

Paper Title:

Name of the Reviewer:

Review

Paper Summary: Please summarize the paper in your own words.

Expected answer: A single paragraph summarizing your understanding of the paper.

Strengths: You may comment on the importance of the problems addressed, the novelty of the proposed solutions, the technical depth and potential impact.

Expected answer: A bulleted list of single sentences. Of course, these above are just guidelines to help reviewers assess the quality of the paper. It is not mandatory to address all the listed merits.

Weaknesses:

Expected answer: A bulleted list of single sentences. Again, think of the above properties.

Reproducibility:

1. Is the code made publicly available?
2. Is the dataset used made publicly available?
3. Is the description of the methodology complete to allow one to redo this experiment?

Expected answer: Yes/No/Not applicable/Partially (Explain why)

Detailed Comments:

1. Does the abstract convince the reader to read the full paper?
2. Does the introduction identify a research question? Is the research question well-motivated?
3. Does the paper clearly position itself with the state of the art?
4. What is the novelty of the paper?
5. What technical aspects are missing to understand the paper?
6. Presentation quality of the paper: Is the paper well-written and well-organized?
7. Does the conclusion address the problem identified in the introduction?

Expected answers: Provide an answer to each of the questions in the list. The answer should be one to three sentences long. Please motivate your answer rather than just provide a short yes/no.

Additional Comments (if any) that you would like to provide to the authors:

Expected answer: This is optional, but it gives you space to provide any additional comments that were not covered previously. No length requirements.