

Vision Lab CVPR 2012 Internal Review Form

Reviewer:

Paper Author names	
the paper's contributions, and list its positive and negative points.	
Overall Rating Definitely Accept/Weakly Accept/Borderline/Weakly Reject/Definitely Reject	
Detailed justification of Overall Rating	
Confidence	
Novelty Very original/ Moderately original/Minor originality/ Has been done before	
Please justify your evaluation of novelty	
Importance / Relevance Of broad interest/Of sufficient interest/Of limited interest Irrelevant or out of scope	
Please justify your importance of relevance	
Reference to Prior Work Excellent reference References adequate References missing Does not cite relevant work	
missing reference	
Clarity of Presentation Very clear/Clear enough Difficult to read/Unreadable	
Technical Correctness Definitely correct Probably correct (did not check completely) Contains minor errors Has major problems	
Experimental Validation Sufficient validation/ theoretical paper Limited but convincing Lacking in some respect Insufficient validation	

<p>Are there sufficient algorithmic and experimental details and available datasets that a graduate student could replicate the experiments in the paper? Or provide a reference implementation?</p>	
--	--