

---

## ACL 2019 Review Form

<b>Submission #:</b> <b>Authors:</b> <b>Submission Type:</b> <b>Primary Subject Area:</b>	<b>Reviewer:</b> <b>Secondary Reviewer:</b> <input type="text"/>
--	---

---

Please consult the [review instructions with detailed explanation of the form](#) before finalizing your review.

---

### 1. In-Depth Review

The answers to the following questions are mandatory, and will be shared with both the committee and the authors.

**What is this paper about, what contributions does it make, what are the main strengths and weaknesses?**

Please describe what problem or question this paper addresses, and the main contributions that it makes towards a solution or answer. Also please include the main **strengths** and **weakness** of this paper and the work it describes.

**Reasons to accept**

What would be the main benefits to the ACL community if this paper were to be presented at the conference.

**Reasons to reject**

What would be the main risks of having this paper presented at the conference (other than lack of space to present better papers)?

**Overall Recommendation**

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
Overall Recommendation	

Do you think this paper should be accepted to the Conference? In making your overall recommendation, please take into account all of the paper's strengths and weaknesses. Please rank short papers relative to other short papers, and long papers relative to other long papers. Acceptable short submissions include: small, focused contributions; works in progress; negative results and opinion pieces; and interesting application notes.

- 5 = Exciting: I would fight for this paper to be accepted.
- 4 = Strong: I would like to see it accepted.
- 3 = Borderline: It has some merits but also some serious problems. I'm ambivalent about this one.
- 2 = Mediocre: I would rather not see it in the conference.
- 1 = Poor: I would fight to have it rejected.

-- select --

### Reviewer Confidence (1-5)

How confident are you in your assessment of this paper?

- 5 = Positive that my evaluation is correct. I read the paper very carefully and I am very 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 was hard for me to understand. My evaluation is just an educated guess.

-- select --

## 2. Additional Feedback for the Author(s)

The answers to the following questions are optional. They will be shared with both the committee and the authors, but are primarily for the authors.

## Questions and Suggestions for the Author(s)

Other than the points mentioned above, please give any additional feedback to the authors that you feel could help them improve the work or its presentation in the paper. Include any points that were unclear or questions that the paper raises, that the authors could address in a revised version (either for the conference or elsewhere), as well as suggestions for changes to the organization of the paper.

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the author to provide additional feedback. A small diagonal slash is visible in the bottom right corner of the box.

## Missing References

Please list any references that should be included in the bibliography or need to be discussed in more depth.

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for listing missing references. A small diagonal slash is visible in the bottom right corner of the box.

## Typos, Grammar, and Style

Please list any typographical or grammatical errors, as well as any stylistic issues that should be improved.

### 3. Confidential Information

The answers to the following questions will be shared with the committee only, not the authors.

#### Recommendation for Presentation Type

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<p><b>Recommendation for Presentation Type</b></p> <p>Note that the published proceedings will make no distinction between papers presented orally and those presented as posters. Would this paper make for a better oral or poster presentation?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Oral <input type="radio"/> Poster <input type="radio"/> No Preference</p>

#### Recommendations for Awards

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<p><b>Recommendation for Best Paper Award</b></p> <p>Do you think this paper should be considered for a Best Paper Award? There will be separate Best Paper Awards for long and for short papers.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>

#### Justification for Best Paper Award Recommendations

Please describe briefly why you think this paper should receive an award. Your comments will not be shared with the authors, but if the paper receives an award, it is possible that some of your comments may be made public (but remain anonymous) in the award citation.

**Confidential Comments to the Area Chairs/PC chairs**

Is there anything you want to say solely to the committee?  
For example, a very strong (negative) opinion on the paper, which might offend the authors in some way, or something which would expose your identity to the authors.

*This is a test - in the real review form, you would see the submission button below.*

---

Back

---