

Review

Title of paper:

Author(s):

1 EVALUATION ITEMS:

1) Research statement: 1-10:

Is the research statement concise?

- 1: Not given
- 4: Moderately concise
- 7: Fairly concise
- 10: Very concise

2) Relevance: 1-10:

What is the relevance of this work to researchers in the applicable subarea?

- 1: Not relevant
- 4: Somewhat relevant
- 7: Moderately relevant
- 10: Relevant

3) Significance: 1-10:

Are the results that will emerge from the project important? Are other people (practitioners or researchers) likely to use these ideas or build on them? Does the proposed work address a difficult problem in a better way than previous research? Does it promise to advance the state of the art in a demonstrable way? Does it promise to provide unique data, unique conclusions on existing data, or a unique theoretical or pragmatic approach?

- 1: Not significant
- 4: Moderately significant
- 7: Significant
- 10: Highly significant

4) Novelty: 1-10:

Are the problems or approaches novel? Is this a novel combination of familiar techniques? Is it clear how this work differs from previous contributions? Is related work adequately referenced?

- 1: Not novel
- 4: Moderately novel
- 7: Novel
- 10: Novel and innovative; will open up new areas of research

5) Clarity: 1-10:

Is the paper well-written? Are ideas presented in a clear manner? Was it well-organized?

- 1: Poor
- 4: Satisfactory
- 7: Good
- 10: Excellent

2 REVIEWERS CONFIDENCE

Confidence Score: 1-10:

Explanation of Confidence Score Values:

1: The reviewer's evaluation is an educated guess and it is quite likely that the reviewer did not understand central parts of the presentation. Either the presentation is not in the reviewer's area, or it was extremely difficult to understand

4: The reviewer is fairly confident that the evaluation is correct. It is possible that the reviewer did not understand certain parts of the presentation, or that the reviewer was unfamiliar with a piece of relevant literature.

7: The reviewer is confident but not absolutely certain that the evaluation is correct. It is unlikely but conceivable that the reviewer did not understand certain parts of the presentation, or that the reviewer was unfamiliar with a piece of relevant literature.

10: The reviewer is absolutely certain that the evaluation is correct and very familiar with the relevant literature.

3 WRITTEN FEEDBACK TO AUTHORS

Please provide a brief summary of key strengths of the proposed work/approach:

Please provide a brief summary of key weaknesses of the proposed work/approach: