

The 23rd Conference on Robots and Vision (CRV 2026) - Reviewer Guidelines

Thank you for serving on the program committee of CRV 2026 as a reviewer. Publications in conferences have a critical impact on scientific careers in our fields. Reviews on which acceptance or reject decisions are made are therefore of critical importance and should be written carefully.

Important Dates

We ask that you take your duty seriously and have your reviews ready on time. Please make a note of these deadlines on your calendar.

Reviews Assigned: February 23, 2026

Please download your papers and check for conflicts or invalid submissions

Reviews Due: March 20, 2026 [11:59 PM Pacific Time]

Please have your reviews submitted before the deadline. Late reviews hold up the decisions.

IMPORTANT LINKS

Conference website: <https://www.computerrobotvision.org/>

This document: <https://tinyurl.com/crv2026-reviewer-guidelines>

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

First, check your papers for conflicts

As soon as you get your reviewing assignment, please download your papers and go through them to make sure that there is no obvious conflict with you (e.g., a paper authored by your recent collaborator from a different institution). If you feel you are in conflict with a paper, please let us know right away by emailing the Program Chairs.

Single-Blind Reviews

Please be aware that CRV is not a double-blind conference where authors must hide their identities. Instead, CRV is a single-blind conference, where the authors are known, but the identities of the reviewers are anonymous.

Using the IEEE Template

In previous years, many CRV authors have not used the correct paper template. This causes problems later when papers are accepted and the final program is being prepared. This year we will be strict on enforcing that authors use the correct paper template (all authors must confirm they have used the correct Latex/Word templates). If you have a paper that appears to be using the incorrect format, please contact the Program Chairs with the paper ID and title.

An example of the appropriate CRV template can be found at this [link](#).

Guidelines for reviewing

Be Specific

Please be specific and detailed in your reviews. In the discussion of related work and references, simply saying "this is well known" or "this has been common practice in the industry for years" is *unacceptable*: cite specific publications, including books, or public disclosures of techniques. Please put yourself in the authors' shoes. It is disappointing for all of us as authors to see "this has been done before"-type remarks that do not specifically state who has done this before. Such remarks are also difficult to argue against.

Your main critique of the paper should be written in terms of a list of strengths and weaknesses of the paper. Use bullet points here, and explain your arguments. Your discussion, sometimes more than your score, will help the authors, fellow reviewers, and Area Chairs understand the basis of your opinions, so please be thorough. Your reviews will be returned to the authors, so you should include specific feedback on ways the authors can improve their papers. For more suggestions on writing your reviews, read the section below on Writing Technical Reviews.

Handling papers not in your specific area

CRV is a smaller conference compared to CVPR, ICCV, ICRA, and IROS, which involves very broad applications that span computer vision and robotics, as well as mainstream topics. Paper assignments are done by the PCs who rely on the TPMS and your subject areas. It is very likely you will be assigned a paper that may be out of your specific research area. In such cases, we ask that you do the best you can to review the paper. We trust your ability to distinguish between good papers and those that are not yet ready for acceptance.

Confidentiality

Submissions should be treated as confidential. As a reviewer for CRV, you have the responsibility to protect the confidentiality of the ideas represented in the papers you review. CRV submissions are not published documents. The work is considered new or proprietary by the authors; otherwise they would not have submitted it. Sometimes the work is still considered confidential by the authors' employers. These organizations do not consider sending a paper to CRV for review to constitute a public disclosure. Protection of the ideas in the papers you receive means:

- You should not show the paper to anyone else, including colleagues or students, unless you have asked them to write a review, or to help with your review.
- You should not show any results, videos/images, code or any of the supplementary material to non-reviewers.
- You should not use ideas/code from papers you review to develop your own ideas/code.

After the review process, you should destroy all copies of papers and supplementary material and erase any code that the authors submitted as part of the supplementary, and any implementations you have written to evaluate the ideas in the papers, as well as any results of those implementations.

Writing Technical Reviews

Here are some recommendations that may help you as you do this very valuable task.

We volunteer our time by reviewing papers that are written by other researchers in our field. We recommend that you approach your reviews in this spirit of volunteerism. Your reviews make you a gatekeeper in helping decide which papers are ready for publication. Just as important, however, is to provide feedback to the authors so that they may improve their work. Try to write your review in a way that the authors can benefit from. We suggest reading a paper and then thinking about it over the course of several days before you write your review.

The tone of your review is also important. A harshly written review will be disregarded by the authors, regardless of whether your criticisms are true. If you take care, it is always possible to word your review diplomatically while staying true to your thoughts about the paper. Put yourself in the mindset of writing to someone you wish to help, such as a respected colleague who wants your opinion on a concept or a project.

Here are some specific issues to keep in mind as you write your reviews:

- Short reviews are not helpful to authors, other reviewers, and the Program Chairs. If you have agreed to review a paper, you should take enough time to write a thoughtful and detailed review.
- Be specific when you suggest that the writing needs to be improved. If there is a particular section that is unclear, point it out and give suggestions for how it can be clarified.
- Don't give away your identity by asking the authors to cite several of your own papers. Don't do this anyways.
- Be specific about novelty. Claims in a review that the submitted work "has been done before" MUST be backed up with specific references and an explanation of how closely they are related. At the same time, for a positive review, be sure to summarize what novel aspects are most interesting in the strengths.
- If you think the paper is out of scope for CRV subject areas, clearly explain why in the review. You may find the Call for Papers here ([link](#)). Then suggest other publication possibilities (journals, conferences, workshops) that would be a better match for the paper.
- Avoid referring to the authors by using the phrase "you". These phrases should be replaced by "the authors" or "the paper". Referring to the authors as "you" can be perceived as being confrontational, even though you do not mean it this way.
- Be generous about giving the authors new ideas for how they can improve their work. Your suggestions may be very specific (for example, "this numerical solver would be better for your application") or may be more general in nature. You might suggest a new dataset that could be tried or a new application area that might benefit from their tool. You may tell them how their idea can be generalized beyond what they have already considered. A thoughtful review not only benefits the authors but may benefit you as well. Remember that your reviews are read by other reviewers and especially the Area Chairs, in addition to the authors. Being a helpful reviewer will generate goodwill towards you in the research community.

Be professional and have your reviews completed by the deadline

Belittling or sarcastic comments have no place in the reviewing process. The most valuable comments in a review are those that help the authors understand the shortcomings of their work and how they might improve it. Write a courteous, informative, incisive, and helpful review that you would be proud to add your name to were it not anonymous.

**** MOST IMPORTANT**** *Please complete your reviews by the deadline. We cannot release the reviews to the authors until all reviews are in. A single reviewer can hold up the entire conference by being late.*