**CPSC 4120/6120 Paper Review Template**

**Originality**

Originality addresses the presence of new ideas or approaches in the context of prior eye-tracking literature. How would you rate the originality of this paper?

* + Very high originality
	+ High originality
	+ Medium originality
	+ Low originality
	+ Very low originality

**Significance**

Significance addresses the paper’s contribution to eye tracking research & applications and the benefits others can gain from it. How would you rate the significance of this paper?

* + Very high significance
	+ High significance
	+ Medium significance
	+ Low significance
	+ Very low significance

**Research Quality**

Research quality addresses how confidently the reader can take up the contribution of the work, judged by the context in which the work is situated. How would you rate the research quality of the methods and discussions used in the paper?

* + Very high research quality
	+ High research quality
	+ Medium research quality
	+ Low research quality
	+ Very low research quality

**Contribution Compared to Length**

Considering the paper length and its self-reported length category, is the paper’s length commensurate with its contribution?

* + The paper length is commensurate with its contribution.
	+ The paper is too short to address its claimed contribution.
	+ The paper is too long in addressing its claimed contribution.

**Recommendation**

Mark your recommendation for this paper.

* + Accept with minor revisions
	+ Accept with minor revisions or Revise and Resubmit
	+ Revise and Resubmit
	+ Reject or Revise and Resubmit
	+ Reject

**Review**

Write your review of the paper on the next page. Address each of the following issues:

* **Originality:** what new ideas or approaches are introduced? We want to emphasize that an acceptable paper must make a clear contribution to Human-Computer Interaction;
* **Significance:** evaluate the paper's contribution to HCI and the benefit that others can gain from the contribution: why do the contribution and benefit matter?
* **Research quality:** how confidently can researchers and practitioners use the results?
* **Previous work:** is prior work adequately reviewed?
* **Presentation clarity:** how well is the paper framed and is the argument clear throughout the paper?
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