

Robotics Science & Systems — 2014 Review Form

General Evaluation Section

1. Please provide the technical review summary: technical contributions, strengths, and weaknesses. (*text box*)
2. If this paper describes a new system (in software or hardware) that combines existing and possibly new components, please comment on the quality of integration and the capabilities of the system as a whole. (~100 words) (*text box*)
3. Please describe the three most interesting aspects of this paper. (~100 words) (*text box*)

Qualitative Evaluation Section

4. Technical Strength: Is the paper technically sound? (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: Major technical contribution; Technically sound; Has minor errors; Has major errors; Fundamentally incorrect)
5. Evaluation of Results: Are the claims well supported (by experimental evaluation or proofs)? (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: Very convincing and thorough; Convincing; Some small additional evaluation is needed; Significant additional evaluation is needed; This work is lacking a necessary evaluation)
6. Significance and Relevance: Is the community likely to use the results? (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: Highly significant; Significant; Moderately significant; Limited significance or relevance; Not relevant or significant to this community)
7. References to Prior Work. (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: Excellent; Very Good; Good; Fair; Poor)
8. Clarity: Is the paper well organized and clearly written? (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: Excellent; Very Good; Good; Fair; Poor)
9. Originality: Does this work contain new problems or approaches? Does it combine existing methods in novel ways? If the paper is a systems paper, this question refers to the system as a whole. (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: Excellent; Very Good; Good; Fair; Poor)
10. Please justify below any low marks in Questions 4–9. Also include any additional comments to the authors (including structural or text errors). (*text box*)
11. Comments to committee (*text box*)

Quantitative Evaluation Section

12. Quality Score: This score reflects the overall quality of the paper. (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: Excellent - among the top 15% of accepted conference papers in robotics over the last 5 years, a clear accept; Great - an accept, a solid paper; Reasonable - on the borderline, an OK paper but perhaps not quite good enough; Not good enough - a straightforward case of not good enough for acceptance in your opinion)

13. Impact Score: This score is independent of the Quality Score and will be used when other scores are less informative. (*multiple choice*) (Choices are: This work is different enough from typical submissions to potentially have a major impact on a subset of the robotics community; Although the paper could be improved, this work does contain something valuable to the community; This work is incremental and unlikely to have much impact even though it may be technically correct and well executed.)

14. Explanation of Your Overall Recommendation Please explain in 1–2 paragraphs the key considerations that have led to your Quality (Question #12) and Impact Score (Question #13). Your answer to this question is extremely important. Please note that the Rebuttal Form asks the authors to comment on your answer to this question. (*text box*)