README

The guideline is adapted from the guideline for Neurips 2020 reviewer guidelines

- The following are example questions that you should consider answering in your review.
- You can select the papers listed on the course website that you are interested in, but you should **not** review the papers that you presented (or will present).
- You should write reviews for **at least 3** papers. If you choose to submit more than 3 reviews, the three **highest** scores will be selected.
- Please make sure to include the following things in your submitted PDF on Canvas:
    1. The title of the paper that you are reviewing.
    2. Your name and NetID.

EXAMPLE QUESTIONS

1. Summary and contributions: Briefly summarize the paper and its contributions

Summarize the paper's motivation, key contributions, and achievements in a paragraph.

Although this part of the review may not provide much new information to authors, it is invaluable to ACs, SACs, and program chairs, and it can help the authors determine whether there are misunderstandings that need to be addressed in their author response.

There are many examples of contributions that warrant publication at a top-tier conference. These contributions may be theoretical, methodological, algorithmic, empirical, connecting ideas in disparate fields ("bridge papers"), or providing a critical analysis (e.g., principled justifications of why the community is going after the wrong outcome or using the wrong types of approaches.).

For more examples of what is intended for this question, see section Examples of Review Content of this guide.

2. Strengths: Describe the strengths of the work. Typical criteria include soundness of the claims (theoretical grounding, empirical evaluation), significance and novelty of the contribution, and relevance to the community.

List the strengths of the submission. For instance, it could be about the soundness of the theoretical claim or the soundness of empirical methodology used to validate an empirical approach. Another important axis is the significance and the novelty of the contributions relative to what has been done already in the literature, and here you may want to cite these relevant prior works. One measure of the significance of a contribution is (your belief about) the level to which researchers or practitioners will make use of or be influenced by the proposed ideas. Solid, technical papers that explore new territory or point out new directions for research are preferable to papers that advance the state of the art, but only incrementally. Finally, a possible strength is the relevance of the line of work for the research community.

Clarification of these axes of evaluation, as well as example quotes from past NeurIPS reviews, can be found in the section Examples of Review Content of this guide.

3. Weaknesses: Explain the limitations of this work along the same axes as above.

This is like above, but now focussing on the limitations of this work.

Your comments should be detailed, specific, and polite. Please avoid vague, subjective complaints. Think about the times when you received an unfair, unjustified, short, or dismissive review. Try not to be that reviewer! Always be constructive and help the authors understand your viewpoint, without being dismissive or using inappropriate language. Remember that you are not reviewing your level of interest in the submission, but its scientific contribution to the field!

4. Correctness: Are the claims and method correct? Is the empirical methodology correct?

Explain if there is anything incorrect with the paper. Incorrect claims or methodology are the primary reason for rejection. Be as detailed, specific, and polite as possible. Thoroughly motivate your criticism so that authors will understand your point of view and potentially respond to you.

5. Relation to prior work: Is it clearly discussed how this work differs from previous contributions?

Explain whether the submission is written with the due scholarship, relating the proposed work with the prior work in the literature. The related work section should not just list prior work, but explain how the proposed work differs from prior work that appeared in the literature.

Note that authors are excused for not knowing about all non-refereed work (e.g, those appearing on ArXiv). Papers (whether refereed or not) appearing less than two months before the submission deadline are considered contemporaneous to conference submissions; authors are not obligated to make detailed comparisons to such papers (though, especially for the camera-ready versions of accepted papers, authors are encouraged to).

6. Additional feedback, comments, suggestions for improvement, and questions for the authors

Add here any additional comment you might have about the submission, including questions and suggestions for improvement.