

ACL 2016

START Conference Manager

Katrin Erk (katrin\_erk)

[User](#) [Manager](#) [Tracks](#) [Committee](#) [Publication](#) [Registration](#)
[2 Warnings!](#) [Usr Mgr](#) [FAQ](#) 
**ACL 2016: The 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics****Review Form****Submission #17:** Dummy paper: Survey**Authors:** Katrin Erk and Noah A. Smith**Submission Type:** Survey Papers**Subject Area:** Machine Learning and Topic Models for Language Processing**Reviewer:** Katrin Erk**Secondary Reviewer (if any):** **Summary Ranking**

Please evaluate the submission according to the criteria below.

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<b>APPROPRIATENESS (1-5)</b>  Does the paper fit in ACL 2016? (Please answer this question in light of the desire to broaden the scope of the research areas represented at ACL.)  5: Certainly. 4: Probably. 3: Unsure. 2: Probably not. 1: Certainly not.	<input type="text" value="-- select --"/>
<b>CLARITY (1-5)</b>  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.	<input type="text" value="-- select --"/>
<b>ORIGINALITY (1-5)</b>  Does this paper address an area that has not been adequately addressed in previous survey papers?  5 = Novel: A high-quality survey of this area does not exist. 4 = Noteworthy: Although surveys of this area do exist, they are either outdated or this survey takes a different approach that is enlightening. 3 = Respectable: A nice survey of an area that provides some extra information not available in other survey papers. 2 = Marginal: Minor additions or improvements to previous surveys. 1 = Little to be gained from this survey paper.	<input type="text" value="-- select --"/>
<b>IMPACT OF THE SURVEY (1-5)</b>  How influential will the survey be? Will it serve as a useful resource for other researchers? Will it be essential background reading for someone just beginning research in an area for which it is relevant?  5 = A superb survey that will be read and highly recommended to others. Synthesizes past material and gives insight. Will be heavily cited. 4 = A useful survey for new researchers, but of little utility for those already working in the area. Synthesizes past material but adds little insight. Will have a reasonable number of citations. 3 = Some impact on computational linguistics research but will not be viewed as important. Essentially a laundry list of past work. 2 = Marginally interesting. May or may not be cited. 1 = Will have no impact on the field.	<input type="text" value="-- select --"/>

<p><b>COMPREHENSIVENESS / CORRECTNESS (1–5)</b></p> <p>Does the paper provide a comprehensive overview of the area? Are all of the most important contributions included? Does the paper appropriately compare and contrast the different work? Is the survey correct in its discussion of approaches, methodologies, etc.?</p> <p>5 = The survey is thorough and manages to cover all of the most important work in the area. The survey correctly analyzes the different approaches and provides a critical analysis that is enlightening.  4 = Generally solid work, although there are some aspects of the survey that could be improved.  3 = Fairly reasonable work. The survey is good, but overlooks some important work in the area or is missing a strong critical analysis of the work that is described.  2 = Troublesome. The survey is very limited and does not provide a good overview of the area.  1 = Fatally flawed. The survey incorrectly describes the projects in the area.</p>	<div>-- select --</div>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION (1–5)</b></p> <p>There are many good submissions competing for slots at ACL 2016; how important is it to feature this one? Will people learn a lot by reading this paper or seeing it presented?</p> <p>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 conference 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 authors have a few weeks to address reviewer comments before the camera-ready deadline.</p> <p>Should the paper be accepted or rejected?</p> <p>5 = This paper changed my thinking on this topic and I'd fight to get it accepted;  4 = I learned a lot from this paper and would like to see it accepted.  3 = Borderline: I'm ambivalent about this one.  2 = Leaning against: I'd rather not see it in the conference.  1 = Poor: I'd fight to have it rejected.</p>	<div>-- select --</div>
<p><b>REVIEWER CONFIDENCE (1–5)</b></p> <p>5 = Positive that my evaluation is correct. I read the paper very carefully and am 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 is very hard to understand. My evaluation is just an educated guess.</p>	<div>-- select --</div>
<p><b>PRESENTATION FORMAT</b></p> <p>Papers at ACL 2016 can be presented either as poster or as oral presentations. If this paper were accepted, which form of presentation would you find more appropriate?</p> <p>Note that the decisions as to which papers will be presented orally and which as poster presentations will be based on the nature rather than on the quality of the work. There will be no distinction in the proceedings between papers presented orally and those presented as poster presentations.</p>	<div>-- select --</div>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION FOR OUTSTANDING PAPER AWARD (1–3)</b></p> <p>3 = Definitely.  2 = Maybe.  1 = Definitely not.</p>	<div>-- select --</div>
<p><b>MENTORING</b></p> <p>Do you think that this paper needs the help of a mentor in its writing, organization or presentation?</p>	<div>-- select --</div>
<p><b>AUTHOR RESPONSE</b></p> <p>Have you read the author response?</p> <p>NOTE: In your initial review, please select "N/A" as there is no author response yet. After the author response is in, please read and change your rating to "YES".</p>	<div>-- select --</div>

---

**Detailed Comments**

Please supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. 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.

Enter comments here:

- Strengths:

  

- Weaknesses:

  

- General Discussion:

---

**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.

---

Submit

---