ACL 2005	START ConferenceManager

ACL 2005: The 43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics

Electronic Review Form

Paper #99: German Particle Verbs: Identification and Characterisation of Semantic Nearest Neighbours **Authors:** Sabine Schulte im Walde	**Reviewer:** Kemal Oflazer **Secondary Reviewer** (*if any*) [ ]

Evaluation

Please evaluate the submission according to the criteria below. Scores for numerical categories are ordered from "bad" to "good." That is, **a low score represents a negative evaluation, and a high score represents a positive evaluation.**

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
Implications / Significance / Importance (1-5) How important are the claims? Will the lessons learned have an impact on a lot of researchers in the field, or is it of minor significance but still interesting? Is this a complete piece of work, or merely a "position paper"? Does the paper address a difficult problem in a better way than previous research? Does it advance the state of the art? Does it provide unique data, unique conclusions on existing data, or a unique theoretical or experimental approach?	1
Clarity of Presentation (1-5) Does the paper clearly present what was done? Is it well-written and well-structured? Does the English need cleaning up? Does it adequately inform the reader? (A superbly written paper provides enough information for the expert reader to reproduce the results. Consider whether any obscurity could be fixed with relatively little effort, or whether the paper requires more work than is likely to be carried out in the time available.)	1
Originality / Innovativeness (1-5) How original is the approach? Does this paper break new ground in topic, methodology, or content? How exciting and innovative is the research it describes?	1
Correctness / Soundness (1-5) Are the reported claims and results correct and valid? Is the approach sound?	1

Comparison with Prior Work/References (1-5)

`1`

Do the authors make clear where their paper sits with respect to the existing literature?

- For a theoretical paper, is it clear how this work differs from previous contributions, or is this a reinvention of existing work under new names?
- For a paper reporting an evaluation of an approach or a system, is there a meaningful comparison against the best state-of-the-art prior approaches?

Are any differences well-motivated? Are the authors careful (and honest) about evaluating both the strengths and weaknesses of the work? Are the references adequate and necessary?

Overall Score Recommendation (1-10)

`1`

- 9-10 = This paper is so great, I'd fight to get it accepted

- 7-8 = This paper is pretty good, and I'd like to see it accepted

- 5-6 = I'm ambivalent about this one

- 3-4 = Weak; I'd rather not see this paper accepted

- 1-2 = Awful; I'd fight to have this rejected

Reviewer Confidence (1-5)

`1`

- 5 = I am absolutely positive that my evaluation is correct, and I am very familiar with the relevant literature.

- 4 = I am quite sure; it is unlikely but conceivable that I missed something in the paper or some relevant literature.

- 3 = I am pretty sure, but there's a chance I missed something. I did not carefully check the details, e.g., the math or the quality of the baselines.

- 2 = I am willing to defend the evaluation, but it is quite likely that I missed something or didn't completely understand some central points.

- 1 = This is not my area, or paper is very hard to understand. My evaluation is just an educated guess.

Detailed Comments

Please supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. These comments will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Moreover, if the paper is accepted, the comments should guide the authors in making revisions for a final manuscript. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors. **Reviews without supporting comments may be discounted or disregarded.**

You can enter your comments using one of two options (but not both):

- You can type (or paste) your comments in the textbox below.

- You can pre-edit your comments in a separate file, and then upload the file. This file should contain **plain ascii text only**.

Upload Comments File: [   ] Browse...

or

Enter Comments Here:

Confidential Comments for Committee

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may want to express a very strong (negative) opinion on the paper, which might offend the authors in some way. Or, perhaps you wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share comments of this nature with the committee, this is the place to put them.

This is a test - in the real review form, you would see the submission button below.

Back