

*** Overall Rating**

- Unsuitable to be a NeurIPS workshop.
- Bottom 25% of proposals.
- Borderline proposal. Would not mind either accepting or rejecting.
- Top 25% of proposals.
- Excellent, important and topical workshop. Top 10% of proposals.

*** Review**

Please provide an evaluation of the quality, clarity, originality and significance of this work, including a list of its pros and cons (max 200000 characters). Add formatting using Markdown and formulas using LaTeX. For more information see /faq (/faq)

Write	Preview

*** Summarise Workshop Proposal**

Brief summary of workshop proposal (50 words or less)

*** Rating**

rating

*** Relevance**

The degree to which the proposal is focused on an important and topical problem, and the degree to which it is expected that the community will find the workshop interesting, exciting, and useful.

- (Very Weak) Well way below expectations.
- (Below average) Ok, but not good enough.
- (Average) What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.
- (Above average) Impressive and exciting. Stands out above your average workshop. Compelling.
- (Extraordinary) Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* **Confidence**

- 5: The reviewer is absolutely certain that the evaluation is correct and very familiar with the relevant literature
- 4: The reviewer is confident but not absolutely certain that the evaluation is correct
- 3: The reviewer is fairly confident that the evaluation is correct
- 2: The reviewer is willing to defend the evaluation, but it is quite likely that the reviewer did not understand central parts of the paper
- 1: The reviewer's evaluation is an educated guess

* **Excitement**

Intellectual excitement of the topic. Is it likely to break new ground, or merely reiterate tired, old debates?

- Very weak. Well below expectations.
- Ok, but not good enough.
- What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.
- Impressive and exciting. Stands out above your average workshop. Compelling.
- Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* **Scope**

Breadth of the workshop, is it interesting to a small group in the community or does it cover a wider space. If it is focused on applications, how wide is the reach?

- Very weak. Well below expectations.
- Ok, but not good enough.
- What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.
- Impressive and exciting. Stands out above your average workshop. Compelling.
- Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* **Diversity And Inclusion**

Diversity and inclusion, in all forms. (See expectations in guidelines.)

- Very weak. Well below expectations.
- Ok, but not good enough. Vague answers, unexciting, not compelling, cursory attention, lip-service.
- What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.
- Impressive and exciting. Stands out above your average workshop. Compelling answers, well thought through. Detailed. Setting a new benchmark.
- Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* **Invited Speakers**

Quality of proposed invited speakers (including scientific achievements and presentational ability, and confirmation to speak). Workshop organizers are encouraged to confirm tentative interest from proposed invited speakers and mention this in their proposal.

- Very weak. Well below expectations.
- Ok, but not good enough. Vague answers, unexciting, not compelling, cursory attention, lip-service.
- What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.
- Impressive and exciting. Stands out above your average workshop. Compelling answers, well thought through. Detailed. Setting a new benchmark.

Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* Experience

Organizational experience, potential, and ability of the team.

Very weak. Well below expectations.

Ok, but not good enough.

What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.

Impressive and exciting. Stands out above your average workshop. Compelling.

Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* Discussion

The degree to which the proposed program offers an opportunity for discussion.

Very weak. Well below expectations.

Ok, but not good enough. Vague answers, unexciting, not compelling, cursory attention, lip-service.

What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.

Impressive and exciting. Stands out above your average workshop. Compelling answers, well thought through. Detailed. Setting a new benchmark.

Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* Logistics

Details of logistics for the workshop in its preferred format (the face-to-face components of an in-person workshop, the interactive components of a virtual workshop, the sessions within an in-person workshop that can be shared online, the proper use of our software stack Zoom + SlidesLive + Topia to facilitate the workshop)

Very weak. Well below expectations.

Ok, but not good enough.

What one might typically see for an OK NeurIPS workshop in the past.

Impressive and exciting.

Wow. Possibly the highlight of NeurIPS workshops. Hard to see how to improve.

* Points Of Difference

What makes this workshop enticingly different from the hundreds of NeurIPS workshops held previously, if any?

* Other Considerations

Other dimensions in the expectations not explicitly listed in these criteria, e.g., other things you think the review committee should know about, degree to which this workshop is part of an existing series and is building community, overlap with other proposals you reviewed, etc.

* Pros And Cons

Provide an analysis of pros and cons of the workshop proposal. Justify your scores against the criteria (a few sentences).

Champion