AAA AISI Track Review Form

1. {Summary} Please briefly summarize the main claims/contributions of the paper in your own words. (Please do not include your evaluation of the paper here).

2. {Significance of the problem} How significant is the problem?
   - Excellent: The social impact problem considered by this paper is significant and has not been adequately addressed by the AI community.
   - Good: This paper represents a new take on a significant social impact problem that has been considered in the AI community before.
   - Fair: The social impact problem considered by this paper has some significance and this paper represents a new take on the problem.
   - Poor: This paper’s contribution was elsewhere: it follows up on an existing problem formulation or introduces a new problem with limited immediate potential for social impact.

3. {Engagement with literature} What is the level of engagement with the literature?
   - Excellent: The paper shows an excellent understanding of other literature on the problem, including that outside computer science.
   - Good: The paper shows a strong understanding of other literature on the problem, perhaps focusing on various subtopics or on the CS literature.
   - Fair: The paper shows a moderate understanding of other literature on the topic but does not engage in-depth.
   - Poor: The paper does not engage sufficiently with other literature on the topic.

4. {Novelty of approach} How novel is the approach used in the paper?
   - Excellent: The paper introduces a new model, data gathering technique, algorithm, and/or data analysis technique.
   - Good: The paper substantially improves upon an existing model, data gathering technique, algorithm, and/or data analysis technique.
   - Fair: The paper makes a moderate improvement to an existing model, data gathering technique, algorithm, and/or data analysis technique.
   - Poor: This paper’s contribution was elsewhere: it employs existing models, data gathering techniques, algorithms, and/or data analysis techniques (e.g., the paper presents a new experimental design and evaluation procedure).

5. {Justification of approach} Is the approach used well justified?
   - Excellent: The paper thoroughly and convincingly justifies the approach taken, explaining strengths and weaknesses as compared to other alternatives.
   - Good: The justification of the approach is convincing overall but could have been more thorough and/or alternatives could have been considered in more detail.
   - Fair: The justification of the approach is relatively convincing but has weaknesses.
   - Poor: The justification of the approach is flawed and/or not convincing.
6. {Quality of evaluation} How well is the approach evaluated?

- Excellent: The evaluation was exemplary: data described the real world and was analyzed thoroughly.
- Good: The evaluation was convincing: datasets were realistic; analysis was solid.
- Fair: The evaluation was adequate but had significant flaws: datasets were unrealistic and/or analysis was insufficient.
- Poor: The evaluation was unconvincing.
- Not applicable: The paper does not present an experimental evaluation (the main focus of the paper is theoretical).

7. {Facilitation of follow-up work} How well does this work facilitate follow-up work?

- Excellent: open-source code; public datasets; and a very clear description of how to use these elements in practice.
- Good: some elements are shared publicly (data, code, or a running system) and little effort would be required to replicate the results or apply them to a new domain.
- Fair: moderate effort would be required to replicate the results or apply them to a new domain.
- Poor: considerable effort would be required to replicate the results or apply them to a new domain.

8. {Scope and promise for social impact} What is the paper’s scope and promise for social impact?

- Excellent: The likelihood of social impact is extremely high: the paper’s ideas are already being used in practice or could be immediately.
- Good: The likelihood of social impact is high: relatively little effort would be required to put this paper’s ideas into practice, at least for a pilot study.
- Fair: The likelihood of social impact is moderate: this paper gets us closer to its goal, but considerably more work would be required before the paper’s ideas could be implemented in practice.
- Poor: The likelihood of social impact is low: the ideas proposed in this paper are unlikely to make a significant impact on the proposed problem.

9. {Ethical Considerations} Does the paper adequately address the applicable ethical considerations, e.g., responsible data collection and use (e.g., informed consent, privacy), possible societal harm (e.g., exacerbating injustice or discrimination due to algorithmic bias), etc.?

- Excellent: The paper comprehensively addresses all of the applicable ethical considerations.
- Good: The paper adequately addresses most, but not all, of the applicable ethical considerations.
- Fair: The paper addresses some but not all of the applicable ethical considerations.
- Poor: The paper fails to address most of the applicable ethical considerations.
- Not Applicable: The paper does not have any ethical considerations to address.

10. {Reasons to Accept} Please list the key strengths of the paper (explain and summarize your rationale for your evaluations with respect to questions 1-9 above).
11. {Reasons to Reject} Please list the key weaknesses of the paper (explain and summarize your rationale for your evaluations with respect to questions 1-9 above).

12. {Questions for the Authors} Please provide questions that you would like the authors to answer during the author feedback period. Please number them.

13. {Detailed Feedback for the Authors} Please provide other detailed, constructive, feedback to the authors.

14. {OVERALL EVALUATION} Please provide your overall evaluation of the paper, carefully weighing the reasons to accept and the reasons to reject the paper. Ideally, we should have:

- No more than 25% of the submitted papers in (Accept + Strong Accept + Very Strong Accept + Award Quality) categories;
- No more than 20% of the submitted papers in (Strong Accept + Very Strong Accept + Award Quality) categories;
- No more than 10% of the submitted papers in (Very Strong Accept + Award Quality) categories
- No more than 1% of the submitted papers in the Award Quality category

Choices

- Award quality: Technically flawless paper with groundbreaking impact on one or more areas of AI, with exceptionally strong evaluation, reproducibility, and resources, and no unaddressed ethical considerations.
- Very Strong Accept: Technically flawless paper with groundbreaking impact on at least one area of AI and excellent impact on multiple areas of AI, with flawless evaluation, resources, and reproducibility, and no unaddressed ethical considerations.
- Strong Accept: Technically strong paper with, with novel ideas, excellent impact on at least one area of AI or high to excellent impact on multiple areas of AI, with excellent evaluation, resources, and reproducibility, and no unaddressed ethical considerations.
- Accept: Technically solid paper, with high impact on at least one sub-area of AI or moderate to high impact on more than one area of AI, with good to excellent evaluation, resources, reproducibility, and no unaddressed ethical considerations.
- Weak Accept: Technically solid, moderate to high impact paper, with no major concerns with respect to evaluation, resources, reproducibility, ethical considerations.
- Borderline accept: Technically solid paper where reasons to accept, e.g., novelty, outweigh reasons to reject, e.g., limited evaluation. Please use sparingly.
- Borderline reject: Technically solid paper where reasons to reject, e.g., lack of novelty, outweigh reasons to accept, e.g., good evaluation. Please use sparingly.
- Reject: For instance, a paper with technical flaws, weak evaluation, inadequate reproducibility, incompletely addressed ethical considerations.
- Strong Reject: For instance, a paper with major technical flaws, and/or poor evaluation, limited impact, poor reproducibility, mostly unaddressed ethical considerations.
- Very Strong Reject: For instance, a paper with trivial results, limited novelty, poor impact, or unaddressed ethical considerations.

15. (CONFIDENCE) How confident are you in your evaluation?
- Very confident. I have checked all points of the paper carefully. I am certain I did not miss any aspects that could otherwise have impacted my evaluation.
- Quite confident. I tried to check the important points carefully. It is unlikely, though conceivable, that I missed some aspects that could otherwise have impacted my evaluation.
- Somewhat confident, but there's a chance I missed some aspects. I did not carefully check some of the details, e.g., novelty, proof of a theorem, experimental design, or statistical validity of conclusions.
- Not very confident. I am able to defend my evaluation of some aspects of the paper, but it is quite likely that I missed or did not understand some key details, or can't be sure about the novelty of the work.
- Not confident. My evaluation is an educated guess.

16. {Confidence-Justification} Please provide a justification for your confidence (only visible to SPC, AC, and Program Chairs).

17. (EXPERTISE) How well does this paper align with your expertise?

- Expert: This paper is within my current core research focus and I am deeply knowledgeable about all of the topics covered by the paper.
- Very Knowledgeable: This paper significantly overlaps with my current work and I am very knowledgeable about most of the topics covered by the paper.
- Knowledgeable: This paper has some overlap with my current work. My recent work was focused on closely related topics and I am knowledgeable about most of the topics covered by the paper.
- Mostly Knowledgeable: This paper has little overlap with my current work. My past work was focused on related topics and I am knowledgeable or somewhat knowledgeable about most of the topics covered by the paper.
- Somewhat Knowledgeable: This paper has little overlap with my current work. I am somewhat knowledgeable about some of the topics covered by the paper.
- Not Knowledgeable: I have little knowledge about most of the topics covered by the paper.

18. {Expertise-Justification} Please provide a justification for your expertise (only visible to SPC, AC, and Program Chairs).

19. Confidential comments to SPC, AC, and Program Chairs