Reviewer Slides for CVPR 21

CVPR 21 PCs

Our Principles

- we want to make the best decisions we can to serve the community.
- we want these decisions to be transparent to the authors.
  - While an author may not be happy with a decision, the author should understand why the decision was made.
- we reasonable in decisions.
- we want points of policy to be understood by all.
- we want to minimize appeals.

Your job

- Advise the ACs on which papers to accept to CVPR21
  - Using your skill, judgement and experience
- Ensure that authors understand the basis of your recommendation
  - By writing a review which clearly explains your opinion
  - by responding to rebuttal points fairly and in a timely fashion
- Treat all involved fairly, compassionately and uniformly
  - Support your opinion with information
  - Do not make policy on-the-fly
- Behave ethically, and expect ethical behavior from others
  - Raise and deal with improprieties in papers
  - Avoid conflicts of interest

What should get in?

- Papers that, in your judgement,
  - will have readers at CVPR 21
    - where
      - you understand readers' interests
      - readers would benefit from having read
  - that meet community standards of
    - significance
    - correctness
- Consider scope
  - CVPR is traditionally generous - an out-of-scope reject is unusual

Reviewing tips and steps - I

- Read all papers in your stack
  - which ones will require time and attention?
- Now for each write a brief summary
  - this will expose what you've missed about the paper
  - never omit
- Check paper for standard errors:
  - incorrect mathematics/reasoning/experiment: is this right?
  - omitted material (experiment/context/citations): is stuff missing?
  - done before: if so, by whom? why is this not different?
  - not worth doing: why?

Reviewing tips and steps: - II

- If you suspect mischief
  - policy violation; plagiarism; fraud; unethical behavior; etc
  - notify the AC
    - explain the basis for your concern
  - in review, explain the basis for your concern
    - so author can rebut
    - unless there is a critical need for confidence (most unusual)
  - review as if the problem wasn't there
- Theory:
  - you should not attempt to resolve such things on your own

Reviewing tips and steps - III

- Review should state the papers strengths and weaknesses
  - in a way that informs AC's decision
  - so make it clear what you rely on in your recommendation
    - some problems don't matter, some problems do
- Check your review for standard errors
  - ignorance + inaccuracy
  - pure opinion
  - novelty fallacy
  - blank assertions
  - policy entrepreneurism
  - intellectual laziness
- There is a checklist

Checklist

- Does review summarize the paper briefly?
- Has paper been checked for standard errors?
  - incorrect mathematics
  - omitted material (experiments, context, citations)
  - done before
  - not worth doing
- Does review clearly state strengths and weaknesses?
- Has review been checked for standard mistakes?
  - ignorance + inaccuracy
  - pure opinion
  - novelty fallacy
  - blank assertions
  - policy entrepreneurism
  - intellectual laziness

Your AC is watching you!

- You're there to help the AC
  - you should make a recommendation
  - you should ensure AC understands why you made that recommendation
  - you should read rebuttal and comment
    - did it change your mind? why?

- The AC is there to help you
  - if there's a mischief problem, it's the AC and PC's problem
  - the AC has tried to steer papers to reviewers who can cope
    - if you can't cope, tell the AC
- Remember:
  - the AC knows the names of reviewers; if you're sloppy, they'll notice

Reviewing errors: - I

- Ignorance and inaccuracy
  - Ignorance, example script:
    - Author says: All A are B
    - Referee says: I don't think all A are B
    - Error: you should know or check
    - Safe behavior: don't base opinions on things you don't know about
  - Inaccuracy, example script:
    - Author says: A is a ring, but not a field
    - Referee says: all rings are fields
    - Error: they're not, and you should not have said they were
    - Safe behavior: don't base opinions on things you don't know about

Reviewing errors: -II

- Pure opinion
    - Scripts:
        - Referee says: this isn't good enough for CVPR 21
            - sez who? why?
        - Referee says: CNN's aren't that interesting
            - sez who? why? this is naked partisanship
        - Referee says: Adversarial losses guarantee distribution matches
            - no-one has proven anything reliable here; shrouded in mystery
        - Error: Some remarks are just pure opinion; fun, but mostly of no value
        - Safe behavior:
            - Check; should your sentence have a "because…"?

Reviewing errors - III

- The novelty fallacy
  - Script:
    - Referee: this shouldn't be accepted because it isn't novel
      - no because?
    - Referee: this should be accepted because it is novel
      - hard to take seriously
  - Errors:
    - many important things aren't all that novel
      - small but clever adjustments to SOTA
    - many novel things aren't all that important
      - AND most really silly things are novel

Reviewing errors: - IV

- Blank assertions:
  - Script:
    - Referee: This has been done before.
      - really? by whom? when? are you just bluffing?
    - Referee: Intrinsic images are no longer important.
      - to whom? why?
    - Referee: Experiments on unpublished datasets are unscientific.
      - sez who? why?
    - Referee: Authors are ignorant (resp. careless, incompetent, etc.)
      - !*&@#%! you too
    - Referee: If the authors were smart enough, they'd ….
      - !*&@#%! you too

Refereeing errors -V

- Policy entrepreneurism:
    - Script:
        - Referee: You must publish your dataset
            - No such policy
        - Referee: You must beat SOTA
            - No such policy
        - Referee: You must have a theorem
            - No such policy
        - Referee: You must beat Arxiv paper
            - No such policy

Refereeing errors: - VI

- Intellectual laziness
  - Script:
    - Referee: Doesn't beat SOTA so it must be rejected
      - No: you have to judge whether it is worth reading
        - and this isn't the same thing
    - Referee: Beats SOTA so it must be accepted
      - No: you have to judge whether it is worth reading
        - and this isn't the same thing
    - Referee: Thm V looks wrong
      - No: it's either right or wrong, and you should know which
    - Referee: (finds tiny error and rejects)
      - No: is this error important?
  - Safe behavior: Use your skill and judgement

Checklist

- Does review summarize the paper briefly?
- Has paper been checked for standard errors?
  - incorrect mathematics
  - omitted material (experiments, context, citations)
  - done before
  - not worth doing
- Does review clearly state strengths and weaknesses?
- Has review been checked for standard mistakes?
  - ignorance + inaccuracy
  - pure opinion
  - novelty fallacy
  - blank assertions
  - policy entrepreneurism
  - intellectual laziness