



Render the Possibilities  
**SIGGRAPH2016**

### **How Much to Write in Your Review?**

We want to provide a high quality review for every submission, to help us judge and provide constructive feedback to submitters. The General Submissions venues do not count as academic publications, so it is not necessary to rigorously check everything, as when reviewing a Technical Paper. Given that most submissions are presented in a two-page abstract, substantial constructive comments on technical merits are usually infeasible. Your public comments should indicate that you understood the submission (or tried to), and provide some polite and constructive feedback to the submitter as to why you rated it a particular way.

Many first time jurors struggle to provide longer reviews. You will only need to provide 1-2 paragraphs per submission. These reviews and the scores provide a first pass for the real discussions and decisions that occur at the jury meeting. (See the separate document with sample reviews from prior years.)

### **The Private Comments Section**

During the review process, you will review approximately 45 (in-person jury) or 18 (offsite jury) submissions. At the jury meeting, all in person jurors will need to remember each of them during discussions. A few notes in the private comments section can help trigger your memory. Also, since the jury splits into separate rooms to discuss subsets of the submissions, including strong positive or negative comments in the “private comments” section can ensure you are consulted before a decision, should there be strong disagreement between reviewers.

For offsite reviewers who will not attend the jury meeting, the “private comments” section is your way to voice your opinion to the in person jury. It is very important to provide clear comments in the private section so the jury can consider your views appropriately. This is particularly important for submissions on the borderline or submitted to venues with high acceptance bars (e.g., Courses or Panels), as these submissions will be discussed extensively during the jury meeting. Please do not write your entire review in the “Private Comments” section. This section is not sent to the authors, and we want every review to include some constructive feedback and comments to the authors.

## **Review Tips**

### **Page 2 of 2**

### **Suggestions for How to Review**

#### **Quick Pass Overview of all Submissions**

Complete a quick pass over all submissions, writing a one sentence note for each. After the initial pass, you will have a much better idea of the overall quality of submissions. This gives you an idea of how much time to spend on expanding your reviews. More importantly, you have written at least one sentence for each review.

#### **Review by Format**

Review submissions by format, to ensure consistency between reviews. Read through the submission form, abstract, and the supplementary materials, and add comments immediately into the review form. Upload these periodically to SIS to ensure the General Submissions chair knows you are making progress on your reviews. As you digest the submissions, you can periodically go back and update comments and scores. (Note you can change your submitted reviews until the deadline!)

#### **Using the Offline Review App**

Prints the abstracts and labels each with their submission venue. During the review period, you can then read them one at a time. Next write a score, short comments like "Yes!!" or "No way!" and simplistic arguments on technical or presentation quality. After a period of digestion, you can spend one or two evenings going through all of your reviews, looking at the videos, updating scores, entering comments into the offline review app, and uploading them to SIS.