

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 #14: Dummy paper: Resources and Evaluation Authors: Katrin Erk and Noah A. Smith Submission Type: Resources/Evaluation Subject Area: Lexical Semantics and Ontology	Reviewer: Katrin Erk Secondary Reviewer (if any): <input type="text"/>
---	---

Summary Ranking

Please evaluate the submission according to the criteria below.

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
APPROPRIATENESS (1-5) 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 --"/>
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.	<input type="text" value="-- select --"/>
ORIGINALITY (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? 5 = Surprising: Significant new resource or evaluation methodology -- no prior research has attempted something similar. 4 = Creative: An intriguing resource or evaluation methodology that is substantially different from previous research. 3 = Respectable: A nice research contribution that represents a notable extension of prior resources or evaluations. 2 = Pedestrian: Obvious, or a minor extension to existing work. 1 = Significant portions have actually been done before or done better.	<input type="text" value="-- select --"/>
EMPIRICAL SOUNDNESS / CORRECTNESS (1-5) First, is the technical approach sound and well-chosen? Second, can one trust the empirical claims of the paper -- are they supported by proper experiments and are the results of the experiments correctly interpreted? 5 = The approach is very apt, and the claims are convincingly supported. 4 = Generally solid work, although there are some aspects of the approach or evaluation I am not sure about. 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. 1 = Fatally flawed.	<input type="text" value="-- select --"/>

<p>MEANINGFUL COMPARISON (1-5)</p> <p>Do the authors make clear where the problems and methods sit with respect to existing literature? Are the references adequate? For empirical papers, are the experimental results meaningfully compared with the best prior approaches?</p> <p>5 = Precise and complete comparison with related work. Good job given the space constraints. 4 = Mostly solid bibliography and comparison, but there are some references missing. 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.</p>	-- select --
<p>SUBSTANCE (1-5)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 in terms of outcome. 1 = Seems thin. Not enough ideas here for a full-length paper.</p>	-- select --
<p>IMPACT OF IDEAS OR RESULTS (1-5)</p> <p>How significant is the work described? If the ideas are novel, will they also be useful or inspirational? Does the paper bring any new insights into the nature of the problem?</p> <p>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.</p>	-- select --
<p>IMPACT OF ACCOMPANYING SOFTWARE (1-5)</p> <p>If software was submitted or released along with the paper, what is the expected impact of the software package? Will this software be valuable to others? Does it fill an unmet need? Is it at least sufficient to replicate or better understand the research in the paper?</p> <p>5 = Enabling: The newly released software should affect other people's choice of research or development projects to undertake. 4 = Useful: I would recommend the new software to other researchers or developers for their ongoing work. 3 = Potentially useful: Someone might find the new software useful for their work. 2 = Documentary: The new software useful to study or replicate the reported research, although for other purposes they may have limited interest or limited usability. (Still a positive rating) 1 = No usable software released.</p>	-- select --
<p>IMPACT OF ACCOMPANYING DATASET (1-5)</p> <p>If a dataset was submitted or released along with the paper, what is the expected impact of the dataset? Will this dataset be valuable to others in the form in which it is released? Does it fill an unmet need?</p> <p>5 = Enabling: The newly released datasets should affect other people's choice of research or development projects to undertake. 4 = Useful: I would recommend the new datasets to other researchers or developers for their ongoing work. 3 = Potentially useful: Someone might find the new datasets useful for their work. 2 = Documentary: The new datasets are useful to study or replicate the reported research, although for other purposes they may have limited interest or limited usability. (Still a positive rating) 1 = No usable datasets submitted.</p>	-- select --
<p>RECOMMENDATION (1-5)</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</p>	-- select --

<p>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>	
REVIEWER CONFIDENCE (1-5)	-- select --
<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>	
PRESENTATION FORMAT	-- select --
<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? 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>	
RECOMMENDATION FOR OUTSTANDING PAPER AWARD (1-3)	-- select --
<p>3 = Definitely. 2 = Maybe. 1 = Definitely not.</p>	
MENTORING	-- select --
<p>Do you think that this paper needs the help of a mentor in its writing, organization or presentation?</p>	
AUTHOR RESPONSE	-- select --
<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>	

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