

Please create a google doc in the appropriate “reviews” folder in the provided google drive; the document name should be your name. Please finalize your reviews by mid-night the evening before the corresponding lecture.

Enter your review in the document. Your review should be no more than a page, and should contain the following three sections:

1. Summary (at least 5-6 sentences)

Your summary should be a paragraph (5-6 sentences) that overviews the main points of the paper. The summary should explain at a high level: what problem the paper focuses on; why the problem is important; why other solutions are not sufficient; what are the main insights and contributions of the proposed algorithms / methods / systems. When we grade your summary we will evaluate whether it shows understanding of the paper’s main focus, and if it correctly identifies the main ideas that the paper has to offer.

2. Strengths (at least 2-4 sentences)

You need to identify at least 2 strengths of the paper with respect to its contributions. These **should not** be related to writing style (e.g., “very well-written paper” is not an acceptable strength) or type of the contribution (e.g., system vs theoretical). The strengths you list should identify important insights (e.g., “the paper solves X through an innovative combination of technique A and technique B; this is surprising, because technique B was designed for a completely different problem”). Make sure you provide sufficient backing for the strengths you list. For example, “the paper contains good evaluation” is a superficial comment in itself; augment it to support it: “the paper contains a thorough evaluation on 4 different and diverse real-world datasets, compares against 3 different state-of-the-art methods, and over a full range of parameters”. When we grade this section, we will evaluate whether the strengths you identify are meaningful for this paper.

3. Weaknesses or extensions (at least 2-3 sentences)

Here we expect you to identify at least one weakness of the work presented in the paper. Again, we will not accept superficial comments, such as “the evaluation can be augmented”. Instead, identify exactly what you feel is missing and why you think it is important. If you cannot find a weakness, then we expect you to list a meaningful extension to the work presented in the paper. What would be the next step to take in terms of altering the problem focus, removing assumptions, augmenting the methodology in some way, etc.

