



Render the Possibilities
SIGGRAPH2016

Sample Review #1

Concept (3)
Novelty (1)
Interest (3)
Quality (2)

Public Discussion:

<snip> is a cool project for building <snip> that is easy to use for both new and inexperienced users. However, it has been shown at SIGGRAPH for the last two years. It would have been good to see the submitters clarify how this instantiation will be different compared with previous years. Given the lack of this clarification in the submission, it is hard to know if attendees will want to spend a significant amount of time looking at something that many have already seen.

Venue Summary:

Studio: 2 < Note: Submitted to only 1 venue, same as "Summary" score

Summary (2)
Confidence (1)

Private Commentary:

OK. Maybe I'm a curmudgeon. This isn't fully in my expertise area so my confidence in my review is low. This has been presented <snip> 2x in the last two years, and apparently the only difference this year is they'll give attendees "the opportunity to see the entire workflow." I mean, yes, this project is cool. But I've already seen it, and it's clear they've presented elsewhere quite a bit too. Is there any cool *new* stuff we can let in instead?

Focus Area (N/A)

Sample Reviews

Page 2 of 3

Sample Review #2

Concept (4)
Novelty (3)
Interest (4)
Quality (4)

Discussion:

This talk/course explores how to estimate a surface's **<snip>** parameters using very few **<snip>** under various **<snip>** conditions. This is novel because of **<snip>** and **<snip>** and as such the submitters present a valuable contribution. The submission shows the potential for an exciting talk and course that could be relevant for a variety of SIGGRAPH attendees, allowing them to also learn how to simplify **<snip>**. The submitters make clear the focus for each presentation format, and the course gives attendees the opportunity to learn how to practically replicate the work while the talk focuses more on the novel algorithmic detail

Venue Summary:

Talk: 5 < Note: Submitted to 2 venues; would argue for either
Course: 5

Summary (5) < Summary uses score for most competitive venue (Talks)
Confidence (2)

Private Commentary:

N/A

Focus Area (Research)

Sample Reviews

Page 3 of 3

Sample Review #3

Concept (3)
Novelty (2)
Interest (1)
Quality (3)

Discussion:

This talk/installation explores generating music videos <snip> from existing video and music content by finding correspondences between the video and audio using <snip>. The submitters have developed an interface for achieving this, which they propose to show in a studio installation setup. It looks like it would be fun for attendees to make videos using the submitters system. The floor plan looks sensible for the type of installation proposed.

This is interesting work, and the submission uses a more robust approach than comparable work by <snip> which minimizes artifacts in the video. In the context, of an installation I can imagine attendees spending time with this. The submission does not contain enough information about the differences between <snip> and <snip> for a talk.

Venue Summary:

Talk: 2 < Note: Submitted to 2 venues; would make a good installation
Installation: 4

Summary (2) < Summary uses score for most competitive venue (Talks)
Confidence (1)

Private Commentary:

I wonder how much of an audience this work would have at SIGGRAPH. It doesn't seem to me this would make a good/interesting talk for attendees. This would be great for an Installation.

Focus Area (Research)