Peer review form for a conference paper

The following is a form sent to reviewers of conference papers. It is produced by the EasyChair system which is a service that manages the submission of papers by authors, distribution of papers to reviewers, the collection of reviewers’ reports and their distribution to the programme committee. Finally, it notifies authors of the acceptance/rejection of their papers.

Some highlighting has been added to make the form more readable on the printed page.

---

For your convenience, this form can be processed by EasyChair automatically. You can fill out this form offline and then upload it to EasyChair. Several review forms can be uploaded simultaneously. You can modify your reviews as many times as you want. When filling out the review form please mind the following rules:

1. Lines beginning with --- are comments. EasyChair will ignore them. Do not start lines in your review with --- as they will be ignored. You can add comments to the review form or remove them.
2. Lines beginning with *** are used by EasyChair. Do not remove or modify these lines or the review will become unusable and will be rejected by EasyChair.

---

*** REVIEW FORM ID: 1234::56789
*** SUBMISSION NUMBER: 10
*** TITLE: [Title of the paper]
*** AUTHORS: A N Author
*** PC MEMBER: A Reviewer

---

Please provide a detailed review, including justification for your scores. This review will be sent to the authors unless the PC chairs decide not to do so. This field is required.

Reviewers may choose to add quite a lengthy appraisal of the paper. The very best reviews include suggestions and pointers to related work.
*** REMARKS FOR THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE:
--- If you wish to add any remarks for PC members, please write them below. These remarks will only be used during the PC meeting. They will not be sent to the authors. This field is optional.

*** REVIEWER’S FIRST NAME: (write in the next line)

*** REVIEWER’S LAST NAME: (write in the next line)

*** REVIEWER’S EMAIL ADDRESS: (write in the next line)

--- In the evaluations below, uncomment the line with your evaluation or confidence. You can also remove the irrelevant lines

*** OVERALL EVALUATION:
--- 3 (strong accept)
--- 2 (accept)
--- 1 (weak accept)
--- 0 (borderline paper)
--- -1 (weak reject)
--- -2 (reject)
--- -3 (strong reject)

*** REVIEWER’S CONFIDENCE:
--- 4 (expert)
--- 3 (high)
--- 2 (medium)
--- 1 (low)
--- 0 (null)

*** RELEVANCE WRT. CONFERENCE TOPICS: from 1 (lowest) to 3 (highest)
--- 3 (relevant)
--- 2 (somewhat relevant)
--- 1 (no (off-topic))
*** PAPER ORGANISATION, PROBLEM/SOLUTION PRESENTATION: from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)

--- 5 (excellent)
--- 4 (good)
--- 3 (fair)
--- 2 (poor)
--- 1 (very poor)

*** TECHNICAL SOUNDNESS: from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)

--- 5 (excellent)
--- 4 (good)
--- 3 (fair)
--- 2 (poor)
--- 1 (very poor)

*** ORIGINALITY OF THE PRESENTED WORK: from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)

--- 5 (excellent)
--- 4 (good)
--- 3 (fair)
--- 2 (poor)
--- 1 (very poor)

*** NOMINATE FOR BEST PAPER AWARD: from 1 (lowest) to 2 (highest)

--- 2 (Yes)
--- 1 (No)

*** ACCEPT FOR PRESENTATION ONLY: from 1 (lowest) to 2 (highest)

--- 2 (yes)
--- 1 (no)

*** END

--- Typically this means that the author(s) will be invited to present their paper as a poster. Some conferences will include the paper in the conference proceedings, other conferences do not.---