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Authors: {authors of the paper}

Ratings

Evaluation of work and contribution
5=Excellent work and a major contribution
4=Good solid work of some importance
3=Solid work but marginal contribution
2=Marginal work and very minor contribution
1=Very questionable work and contribution

Originality, Novelty
5=Trailblazing
4=A pioneering piece of work
3=One step ahead of the pack
2=YAPA(yet another paper about...)
1=It's been said many times before

Readability and organization
5=Very good
4=Basically well written
3=Readable
2=Needs considerable work
1=Unacceptably bad

Overall recommendation
5=Definitely accept (very high quality)
4=Accept (good quality)
3=Accept if room (marginal quality)
2=Likely reject (low quality)
1=Definitely reject (has no merit)
Title of Paper
Reviewer:

Summary
One or two paragraphs in your own words summarizing the most important point(s) in the paper, without your opinion on the validity of those points.

Comments
This is the main body of your review. Start with a paragraph that will briefly summarize your opinion of the paper. Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the paper.

Headings (this optional)
Before each point about the paper, insert a heading so the reader of your review can go straight to any particular topic. Illustrate your points with examples. AVOID GENERALITIES. Your points might relate to:
- Importance and correctness of results presented
- Validity of theoretical or experimental methodology
  - measurements
  - simulation
  - theorems
  - proofs
- Clarity of presentation, ease of understanding concepts
- Usefulness and clarity of figures, tables, graphs
- Ways you think the paper could be improved

Future Work
Suggestions for future work:
- Use bullets to suggest a few items for future investigation and why?
- Or questions raised and why?
- Or wider implications of the results