
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, as well as the main contributions that it makes towards a solution or answer. Also include the main **strengths** and **weaknesses** of this paper and the work it describes.

Reasons to accept

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

Reasons to reject

What are 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
<p>Overall Recommendation</p> <p>Do you think this paper should be accepted to ACL2020?</p> <p>In making your overall recommendation, please take into account all of the paper's strengths and weaknesses, the paper's appropriateness for the conference, as well as its clarity and originality. Please rank short papers relative to other short papers, and long papers relative to other long papers. Acceptable long paper submissions must describe substantial, original, and completed work (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.</p> <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: The paper has some merits (e.g., the idea is exciting and/or inspiring). It also has some weaknesses (e.g., evaluation is not complete). I'm ambivalent, but slightly leaning towards acceptance. • There is NO 3 rating: I understand I need to take a stand on my recommendation. • 2.5 = Leaning negative: 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. I'm ambivalent, but slightly leaning towards rejection. • 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. 	<p>-- select --</p>
<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. 	<p>-- select --</p>
<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>	<p>-- select --</p>

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, and Style

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

Additional 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 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.

3. Confidential Information

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

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
<p>Recommendation for Presentation Type</p> <p>We have fewer slots for oral presentations (talks) than for posters, and want to make sure that the most appropriate papers get selected for talks. Note that the published proceedings will make no distinction between papers presented orally and those presented as posters.</p> <p>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>
<p>Ethical Concerns</p> <p>Do you have any ethical concerns that Area Chairs/PC Chairs should be aware of? If so, please select "Yes" and provide more comments in the "confidential comments" box below. We also encourage you to flag this concern to the authors in the weakness section above.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes</p>
<p>Recommendation for Best Paper Award</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"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes</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, an elaboration of your concern about some unethical implications, or 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](#)