

# Review of XXX

Your Name

Date

## 1 Summary

Provide a brief (couple of paragraphs) summary of the paper. What is the problem addressed in the paper? What are the key claims/contributions, and how are they supported (by experiments, by proofs, etc)?

## 2 Evaluation

### **Originality.**

Is the work original? How are the contributions novel compared to previous work? Are the techniques new? Are they a new combination of existing techniques?

### **Significance.**

Is the work significant? Is the problem addressed important? Does the work significantly advance the state of the art, or is the progress incremental? Is the paper likely to have impact?

### **Correctness.**

Are the results technically sound? (If you're reading a paper that has already been published in a respectable venue, chances are high that the main results are correct, but do not count on this. In any case, if you come across any small errors or typos, you can mention those here. If you didn't have the time or background to assess the correctness of a paper, just say so.)

### **Clarity.**

Is the paper easy to read? Is it well structured? Could the presentation be improved?

## 3 Extensions and Further Directions

Can you identify some limitations of the work? What are the assumptions under which the results in the paper are derived? Are these assumptions reasonable? How restrictive/general are the assumptions? Can you broaden the class of problems for which the results can be derived? Are there other extensions you can think of or other questions that come to your mind that could be interesting to explore?

## **4 Any Other Comments**

Any other comments you would like to provide.

## **Acknowledgments**

If your review/judgment of the paper was influenced by your discussions with anyone else, mention their names here.

## **References**

Any references used in your review go here.