

EMNLP 2020 Review Form

Please read the [detailed explanation of the form](#) before entering 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, and 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. Please also include the main **strengths** and **weaknesses** of this paper and the work it describes.

Reasons to accept

What would be the main benefits to the NLP 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)?

Reproducibility

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
Reproducibility How do you rate the paper's reproducibility? Will members of the ACL community be able to reproduce or verify the results in this paper? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Could easily reproduce the results. • 4 = Could mostly reproduce the results, but there may be some variation because of sample variance or minor variations in their interpretation of the protocol or method. • 3 = Could reproduce the results with some difficulty. The settings of parameters are underspecified or subjectively determined; the training/evaluation data are not widely available. • 2 = Would be hard pressed to reproduce the results. The contribution depends on data that are simply not available outside the author's institution or consortium; not enough details are provided. • 1 = Could not reproduce the results here no matter how hard they tried. • N/A = Doesn't apply, since the paper does not include empirical results. 	<div>-- select -- ▾</div>
Reproducibility checklist feedback Are the authors' answers to the Reproducibility Checklist useful for evaluating the submission? Note that this question is for us to collect feedback regarding the usefulness of the reproducibility checklist, and is not about evaluating the paper.	<div>-- select -- ▾</div>

Overall Recommendation

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
Overall Recommendation Should this paper be accepted to EMNLP 2020? In making your overall recommendation, please take into account your reasons to accept and reject the paper, as well as the paper's appropriateness for the conference. As stated in the call for papers, the conference welcomes long and short papers related to empirical NLP . Acceptable long paper submissions must describe substantial, original, and completed work on empirical NLP (e.g., model design and implementation, corpus construction/annotation, evaluation methodologies). Acceptable short submissions include: small, focused contributions; works in progress; negative results and opinion pieces; and interesting application notes. Please adhere to the score definitions below when scoring papers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Transformative: This paper is likely to change our field. It should be considered for a best paper award. • 4.5 = Exciting: It changed my thinking on this topic. I would fight for it to be accepted. • 4 = Strong: I learned a lot from it. I would like to see it accepted. • 3.5 = Leaning positive: It can be accepted more or less in its current form. However, the work it describes is not particularly exciting and/or inspiring, so it will not be a big loss if people don't see it in this conference. • 3 = Ambivalent: It has merits (e.g., it reports state-of-the-art results, the idea is nice), but there are key weaknesses (e.g., I didn't learn much from it, evaluation is not convincing, it describes incremental work). I believe it can significantly benefit from another round of revision, but I won't object to accepting it if my co-reviewers are willing to champion it. • 2.5 = Leaning negative: I am leaning towards rejection, but I can be persuaded if my co-reviewers think otherwise. • 2 = Mediocre: I would rather not see it in the conference. • 1.5 = Weak: I am pretty confident that it should be rejected. • 1 = Poor: I would fight to have it rejected. 	<div>-- select -- ▾</div>

Reviewer Confidence

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<p>Reviewer Confidence</p> <p>How confident are you in your assessment of this paper?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<div>-- select -- ▾</div>

Author Response

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<p>Author Response</p> <p>Have you read the author response?</p> <p>NOTE: In your initial review, please select "N/A" as there is no author response yet. After the author response is in, please read and change your rating to "YES".</p>	<div>-- select -- ▾</div>

2. Questions and 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 for the Author(s)

Please write any questions you have for the author(s) that you would like answers for in the author response, particularly those that are relevant for your overall recommendation.

--

Missing References

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

Typos, Grammar, Style, and Presentation Improvements

Please list any typographical or grammatical errors, as well as any stylistic issues that should be improved. In addition, if there is anything in the paper that you found difficult to follow, please suggest how it could be better organized, motivated, or explained.

3. Confidential Information

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

Recommendations for Awards

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
Recommendation for Best Paper Award 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. In addition, we will have several outstanding paper awards.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

Justification for 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 that would expose your identity to the authors.

In addition, EMNLP 2020 is the first time we have had an ethics policy, please see our CFP for details. If the paper raises any concerns regarding ethics, please share your comments here.