

Reviewer forms

EMNLP 2018 – main conference

1. In-Depth Review

What is this paper about, and what contributions does it make?

Please describe what problem or question this paper addresses, and the main contributions that it makes towards a solution or answer.

[...]

What strengths does this paper have?

Please describe the main strengths you see in the paper or the work it describes, regardless of whether you recommend this paper be accepted or not.

[...]

What weaknesses does this paper have?

Please describe any weaknesses you see in the paper or the work it describes, regardless of whether you recommend this paper be accepted or not.

[...]

Overall Recommendation

Do you think this paper should be accepted to EMNLP 2018? In making your overall recommendation, please take into account all of the paper's strengths and weaknesses. Please rank short papers relative to other short papers, and long papers relative to other long papers. Acceptable short submissions include: small, focused contributions; works in progress; negative results and opinion pieces; and interesting application notes.

- 5 = Exciting: I would fight for this paper to be accepted.
- 4 = Strong: I would like to see it accepted.
- 3 = Borderline: It has some merits but also some serious problems. I'm ambivalent about it.
- 2 = Mediocre: I would rather not see it in the conference.
- 1 = Poor: I would fight to have it rejected.

2. Questions and Feedback for the Author(s)

The answers to the following questions are optional. They will be shared with both the committee and the authors, but are primarily for the authors.

Questions for the Author(s)

Please write any questions you have for the author(s) that you would like answers for in the author response (which you should take into account in your final review).

[...]

Missing References

Please list any references that should be included in the bibliography or need to be discussed in more depth.

[...]

Presentation Improvements

If there is anything in the paper that you found difficult to follow, please suggest how it could be better organized, motivated, or explained.

[...]

Typos, Grammar, and Style

Please list any typographical or grammatical errors, as well as any stylistic issues that should be improved.

[...]

3. Confidential Information

The answers to the following questions will be shared with the committee only, not the authors.

Reviewer Confidence

How confident are you in your assessment of this paper?

- 5 = Positive that my evaluation is correct. I read the paper very carefully and I am very familiar with related work.
- 4 = Quite sure. I tried to check the important points carefully. It's unlikely, though conceivable, that I missed something that should affect my ratings.
- 3 = Pretty sure, but there's a chance I missed something. Although I have a good feel for this area in general, I did not carefully check the paper's details, e.g., the math, experimental design, or novelty.
- 2 = Willing to defend my evaluation, but it is fairly likely that I missed some details, didn't understand some central points, or can't be sure about the novelty of the work.
- 1 = Not my area, or paper was hard for me to understand. My evaluation is just an educated guess.

Confidential Comments to the Area Chairs/PC chairs

Is there anything you want to say solely to the committee?

For example, a very strong (negative) opinion on the paper, which might offend the authors in some way, or something which would expose your identity to the authors.

MWE 2019 – workshop

Appropriateness (1-5)

Does this paper fit in the event? Both empirical and theoretical results are welcome.

5: Certainly.

4: Probably.

3: Unsure.

2: Probably not.

1: Certainly not.

Adherence to the Bender Rule

Does this paper clearly state the language(s) it considers?

Clarity (1-5)

For the reasonably well-prepared reader, is it clear what was done and why? Is the paper well-written and well-structured?

5 = Very clear.

4 = Understandable by most readers.

3 = Mostly understandable to me with some effort.

2 = Important questions were hard to resolve even with effort.

1 = Much of the paper is confusing.

Originality / Innovativeness (1-5)

How original is the approach? Does this paper break new ground in topic, methodology, or content? How exciting and innovative is the research it describes?

Note that a paper could score high for originality even if the results do not show a convincing benefit.

5 = Surprising: Noteworthy new problem, technique, methodology, or insight.

4 = Creative: Relatively few people in our community would have put these ideas together.

3 = Somewhat conventional: A number of people could have come up with this if they thought about it for a while.

2 = Rather boring: Obvious, or a minor improvement on familiar techniques.

1 = Significant portions have actually been done before or done better.

Soundness / Correctness (1-5)

First, is the technical approach sound and well-chosen? Second, can one trust the claims of the paper -- are they supported by proper experiments, proofs, or other argumentation?

5 = The approach is very apt, and the claims are convincingly supported.

4 = Generally solid work, though I have a few suggestions about how to strengthen the technical approach or evaluation.

3 = Fairly reasonable work. The approach is not bad, and at least the main claims are probably correct, but I am not entirely ready to accept them (based on the material in the paper).

2 = Troublesome. There are some ideas worth salvaging here, but the work should really have been done or evaluated differently, or justified better.

1 = Fatally flawed.

Replicability (1-6)

Replicability of the methods and of the results

6 = Not applicable (e.g. for theoretical papers).

5 = Reproduction of the results can be straightforwardly deduced from the paper, the software and/or the data are available.

4 = Reproduction of the results is possible with some effort, the software and the data are

available, but some parameters are unclear.

3 = Reproduction of the results is possible but depends on software or data which are not publicly available.

2 = Reproduction of the results is hard or it is unclear how to perform it.

1 = There is no way to reproduce the results.

Meaningful Comparison (1-5)

Does the author make clear where the problems and methods sit with respect to existing literature? Are the references adequate? Are any experimental results meaningfully compared with the best prior approaches?

5 = Precise and complete comparison with related work. Good job given the space constraints.

4 = Mostly solid bibliography and comparison, but I have some suggestions.

3 = Bibliography and comparison are somewhat helpful, but it could be hard for a reader to determine exactly how this work relates to previous work.

2 = Only partial awareness and understanding of related work, or a flawed empirical comparison.

1 = Little awareness of related work, or lacks necessary empirical comparison.

Thoroughness (1-5)

Does this paper have enough substance, or would it benefit from more ideas or results?

Note that this question mainly concerns the amount of work; its quality is evaluated in other categories.

5 = Contains more ideas or results than most publications in this conference; goes the extra mile.

4 = Represents an appropriate amount of work for a publication in this conference. (most submissions)

3 = Leaves open one or two natural questions that should have been pursued within the paper.

2 = Work in progress. There are enough good ideas, but perhaps not enough results yet.

1 = Seems thin. Not enough ideas here for a full-length paper.

Impact of Ideas or Results (1-5)

How significant is the work described? If the ideas are novel, will they also be useful or inspirational? If the results are sound, are they also important? Does the analysis in the paper bring new insights into the nature of the problem?

5 = Will affect the field by altering other people's choice of research topics or basic approach.

4 = Some of the ideas or results will substantially help other people's ongoing research.

3 = Interesting but not too influential. The work will be cited, but mainly for comparison or as a source of minor contributions.

2 = Marginally interesting. May or may not be cited.

1 = Will have no impact on the field.

Recommendation (1-5)

In deciding on your ultimate recommendation, please think over all your scores above. But remember that no paper is perfect, and remember that we want a workshop full of interesting, diverse, and timely work. If a paper has some weaknesses, but you really got a lot out of it, feel free to fight for it. If a paper is solid but you could live without it, let us know that you're ambivalent. Remember also that the author has a couple of weeks to address reviewer comments before the camera-ready deadline.

Should the paper be accepted or rejected?

5 = Exciting: I'd fight to get it accepted

4 = Worthy: I would like to see it accepted

3 = Borderline: I'm ambivalent about this one

2 = Mediocre: I'd rather not see it in the conference

1 = Poor: I'd fight to have it rejected

Reviewer Confidence (1 - 5)

5 = Positive that my evaluation is correct. I read the paper very carefully and am very familiar with related work.

4 = Quite sure. I tried to check the important points carefully, and checked for uncited prior work. It's unlikely, though conceivable, that I missed something that should affect my ratings.

3 = Pretty sure, but there's a chance I missed something. Although I have a good feel for this area in general, I did not carefully check the paper's details, e.g., the math, experimental design, or novelty.

2 = Willing to defend evaluation, but it is fairly likely that I missed some details, didn't understand some central points, or can't be sure about the novelty of the work.

1 = Not my area, or paper is very hard to understand. My evaluation is just an educated guess.

Strengths

What are the main strengths of the paper?

[...]

Weaknesses

What are the main weaknesses of the paper?

[...]

Detailed Comments

Please supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. Include a summary of the submission. There is no need to copy material from the strengths and weaknesses. These comments will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Moreover, if the paper is accepted, the comments should guide the authors in making revisions for a final manuscript. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors.

[...]

Confidential Comments for Committee

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may want to express a very strong (negative) opinion on the paper, which might offend the authors in some way. Or, perhaps you wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share comments of this nature with the committee, this is the place to put them.

[...]