

RSS 2016 Review Form

Ratings

Quality Score

This score reflects the overall quality of the paper.

- 4: Excellent (among the top 15% of accepted conference papers in robotics over the last 5 years, a clear accept)
- 3: Very Good (an accept, a solid paper)
- 2: Good (on the borderline, an OK paper but perhaps lacking in certain areas)
- 1: Fair (a paper with certain interesting ideas but lacking in a number of important areas)
- 0: Poor (a straightforward case of not good enough for acceptance in your opinion)

Impact Score

This score is independent of the Quality Score and will be used when other scores are less informative.

- 3: This work is different enough from typical submissions to potentially have a major impact on a subset of the robotics community
- 2: Although the paper could be improved, this work does contain something valuable to the community
- 1: This work is incremental and unlikely to have much impact even though it may be technically correct and well executed

Reviewer's Confidence

- 5: (expert)
- 4: (high)
- 3: (medium)
- 2: (low)
- 1: (none)

Technical Strength

Is the paper technically sound?

- 5: Major technical contribution
- 4: Technically sound
- 3: Has minor errors
- 2: Has major errors
- 1: Fundamentally incorrect

Evaluation of Results

Are the claims well supported (by experimental evaluation or proofs)?

- 5: Very convincing and thorough
- 4: Convincing
- 3: Some small additional evaluation is needed

- 2: Significant additional evaluation is needed
- 1: This work is lacking a necessary evaluation

Significance and Relevance

Is the community likely to use the results?

- 5: Highly significant
- 4: Significant
- 3: Moderately significant
- 2: Limited significance or relevance
- 1: Not relevant or significant to this community

References to Prior Work

- 5: Excellent
- 4: Very Good
- 3: Good
- 2: Fair
- 1: Poor

Clarity

Is the paper well organized and clearly written?

- 5: Excellent
- 4: Very Good
- 3: Good
- 2: Fair
- 1: Poor

Originality

Does this work contain new problems or approaches? Does it combine existing methods in novel ways? If the paper is a systems paper, this question refers to the system as a whole.

- 5: Excellent
- 4: Very Good
- 3: Good
- 2: Fair
- 1: Poor

Comments

Confidential Remarks for the Area Chairs (AC)

If you wish to add any remarks intended only for AC members please write them below. These remarks will only be seen by the AC members having access to reviews for this submission. They will not be sent to the authors. This field is optional.

Paper Summary (*)

Please provide a brief (one paragraph) overview of the paper and its (claimed) contributions. (100-200 words)

Description of a New System (in Software or Hardware)

If this paper describes a new system (in software or hardware) that combines existing and possibly new components, please comment on the quality of integration and the capabilities of the system as a whole. (~100 words)

1-2 Most Interesting Aspects (*)

Please describe 1-2 of the most interesting aspects of this paper. (~100 words)

Strengths (*)

Please describe the main strengths of the work presented.

Weaknesses (*)

Please describe the main weaknesses of the work presented.

Explanation of Your Overall Recommendation (*)

Please explain the key considerations that have led to your scores. Your answer to this question is extremely important.