

# REVIEWING INSTRUCTIONS

## Two-minute overview

The ECCV 2022 review process is **double-blind and confidential**.

- Keep the paper confidential. Do not distribute it.
- Do not reveal your identity to the authors

## Criteria

- Rate a paper by the value of its scientific contribution(s) (valuable for at least 2% of the computer vision community, not necessarily yourself). Good benchmark numbers can indicate a valuable contribution, but they are neither necessary nor sufficient for a valuable paper.
- Give enough reasons and information for your rating so that authors and ACs can understand it. “Not new” must be backed by concrete references.
- Papers that are not accepted at a peer-reviewed venue do NOT count as prior work. Do not ask authors to compare against such work. Do not reduce your novelty rating because of such concurrent work.

## Style

- Do not be emotional in your review, and watch your tone. Your review is about the paper, not the authors. Make it worthwhile for the authors and the area chairs. Read over your full review before you finalize it. Being respectful shows you're a professional.

## Logistics

- Check your papers for conflict of interest within two days after the assignment.
- Submit all your reviews by the reviewing deadline (10 May 2022). Delays severely affect the timeline of the reviewing process and are not acceptable.
- Respond to questions by the area chair in the discussion phase.
- Submit all your post-rebuttal and final recommendations by the final recommendation deadline (12 June 2022).

## Perks

- For Outstanding Reviewer Awards, we will only consider those who conclude their reviewing assignments by the pre-rebuttal (10 May 2022) and final recommendation deadlines (12 June 2022).

If you have further questions or doubts, read the detailed instructions below.

## Check your papers immediately to avoid a conflict of interest

As soon as you get your reviewing assignment, please go through all the articles to find cases where:

1. There is a conflict of interest (e.g., a paper authored by your recent collaborator from a different institution or a concurrent work with the same contribution as the work you submitted yourself). To be clear: Please do not try to uncover papers' authors. We only ask that you flag conflicts of interest if you are already familiar with the work presented in the paper and know its authors.

2. You are unable to provide a good review of the paper. However, do not give up just because the article is not to your liking or because it does not perfectly match your area of expertise. Due to various hard constraints, all assignments can't be optimal for you, and reviewers are asked to make a reasonable effort to review the assigned papers.

If either of these issues arises, please let us know by emailing the [Program Chairs](#).

ECCV makes every effort to avoid conflicts in the review assignments, but errors can occur. If you think you have a conflict of interest with a paper you are reviewing, you are **required to contact the Program Chairs** to resolve the matter.

Conflicts of interest include (but are not limited to) situations in which:

- You work at the same institution as one of the authors.
- You have been directly involved in the work and will somehow receive credit.
- You suspect that others might see a conflict of interest in your involvement.
- You have collaborated with one of the authors in the past three years.  
Collaboration is usually defined as writing a paper together or having a joint grant.
- You are knowingly the MS/Ph.D. advisor of one of the authors or the MS/Ph.D student of one of the authors. Before reviewing a paper you know to be written by a former student, you should think carefully.

## Rebuttal

Authors will be allowed to answer your criticisms in a rebuttal. Your review should ask the authors to provide specific information in the rebuttal, such as clarifications on the proposed algorithm and the experimental results. However, refrain from asking for brand new experiments. The rebuttal is not a significant revision of the paper, nor is it fair to ask the authors to perform complex tasks in the short time available for the rebuttal. If you think that a crucial experiment is missing and that the paper cannot be accepted without it, you can reject the paper. However, do not ask the authors to perform this experiment in the rebuttal. The Area Chair can discount your requests if they are unreasonable.

## **Look for innovation, not just benchmarks.**

Look for what is good or stimulating in the paper. Minor flaws can be corrected and shouldn't be a reason to reject a paper. ECCV as a conference is looking for new ideas. We recommend that you embrace novel, brave concepts, even if they have not been tested on your favorite datasets, as long as solid scientific conclusions can be drawn from the experiments. For example, the fact that a proposed method does not exceed the state-of-the-art accuracy of an existing benchmark dataset is not grounds for rejection. The method may highlight a weak spot of an established benchmark and have other scientific evidence supporting the paper's claims. Benchmarks are a popular way to support claims, but there are different ways. Each paper that is accepted should be technically sound, should prove claims using scientific principles, and must contribute in some way to scientific progress in the field.

## **Be specific and provide evidence.**

Please be specific and detailed in your reviews. For example, simply saying “this is well known” or “this has been common practice in the industry for years” is not sufficient: cite specific publications, including books or public disclosures of techniques, and explain the substantial overlap with the reviewed paper. Always explain your rating. Your discussion, sometimes more than your score, will help the authors, fellow reviewers, and Area Chairs understand the basis of your opinions, so please be thorough. We instruct ACs to ignore unsupported responses.

Your reviews will be returned to the authors, so you should include specific feedback on how the authors can improve their papers or research. The authors will disregard a harshly written, emotional review, regardless of whether your criticisms are valid. State your objections clearly and concisely to help the Area Chair decide based on your review. Also, put yourself in the mindset of writing to someone you wish to help, such as a respected colleague who wants your opinion on a concept or a project, to help the authors improve their work.

A thoughtful review benefits the authors and may help you as well. Remember that other reviewers read your assessment, especially the Area Chairs and the authors. In contrast to the authors, Area Chairs will know your name and often ask for your input specifically. Being a helpful reviewer will improve your reputation in the research community. In contrast, returning an uninformative, flawed, or late review will damage your reputation. Area Chairs will be asked to rate your reviews as with previous conferences. These ratings will be used to select outstanding reviewers and to flag potential reviewer problems and may affect your involvement as a reviewer in future conferences.

## Submission guidelines

ECCV has clear policies for submission, including double submissions and plagiarism. Please check that the authors adhere to them and see the Author Guidelines if you are in doubt.

On the other hand, make sure you do not “invent” policies beyond the ones explicitly adopted by ECCV. For instance, ECCV does not have a policy that a dataset or code must be made publicly available. While this is encouraged, there are many valid reasons why this is not always possible. Thus, it is unfair to reject a paper because it contains no promise to make a public release of the data or code. The actual issue you should check is whether the scientific results in the paper are reproducible, which may be easier if code is provided.

## ArXiv papers

Authors are asked to make reasonable efforts to hide their identities, including not listing their names or affiliations and omitting acknowledgments during the review. However, publishing technical reports, arXiv papers, and even social media posts (so long as they do not imply that the article was submitted to ECCV'22) is allowed. Do not, therefore, actively search for the paper online to keep an unbiased view as much as possible.

In line with standard practice in the community, arXiv papers are not considered prior work since they have not been peer-reviewed. Therefore, you should review your ECCV papers independently as if arXiv papers did not exist. Citations to these papers are not

required, and failing to cite or beat the performance of arXiv papers are not grounds for rejection. Please read the FAQ below for guidelines on handling arXiv papers.

## Protect ideas

The ECCV 2020 review process is **double-blind and confidential**. An ECCV submission does not constitute a public disclosure. As a reviewer for ECCV, you are responsible for protecting the confidentiality of the ideas represented in the papers you review. Breaching confidentiality can have severe consequences for the authors and their organizations, such as losing the intellectual property if a patent is pending.

In particular:

- Do not show the paper or supplementary material to anyone else, including colleagues or students, unless you have asked them to write a review or to help with your review.
- Do not discuss the ideas or results in the paper with any non-reviewer.
- Do not use or build on the ideas in your work.
- After the review process is complete, you must destroy all copies of the paper and erase notes or code you have written to evaluate the ideas in the article, including results produced by any such code.

## Further guidelines

- Do not ask the authors to cite your papers unless this is justified. Be aware that the Area Chair can see your name.

- Before you claim a paper is out of scope, carefully check the Call for Papers, clearly explain why, and try to suggest a better venue for it.
- Avoid referring to the authors by using the phrase “you” as it may sound confrontational; use instead “the authors” or, even better, “the paper.”

## Frequently asked questions

### **Is there a minimum number of papers I should accept or reject?**

No. Each paper should be evaluated. Do NOT assume that your stack of papers should have the same acceptance rate as the entire conference. You may have a stack of particularly good or sub-par papers.

### **Can I review a paper I already saw on arXiv or social media and know who the authors are?**

Yes. See the next bullet below for guidelines.

### **How should I treat papers for which I know the authors?**

Treat them like papers for which you do not know the authors. Reviewers must only assess a paper based on its content and not the authors.

### **Why did the paper I am reviewing disappear from the CMT reviewer console?**

The program chairs continually monitor the papers and respond to concerns raised by authors, ACs, and reviewers. As a result, papers may get desk-rejected, reassigned, or, in extreme cases, withdrawn at any point. When we make these changes, the paper will disappear from your reviewer console, and you will not necessarily be notified. Please reach out to the Area Chair through CMT if you have any doubts.

### **How should I treat arXiv papers?**

ArXiv papers are not considered prior work since they have not been peer-reviewed. Therefore, you should review your ECCV papers (primarily) as if the arXiv papers did not exist. For example:



- Do not reject a paper because it has similar ideas to one that appeared on arXiv. However, if you think the arXiv paper was **plagiarized**, notify this issue in the confidential comments to the AC.
- Do not suggest rejection for not citing an arXiv paper.
- Do not regard arXiv as a standard for state of the art. It is not because it is not peer-reviewed. Hence, do not accept/reject a paper solely because it performs better/worse than something on arXiv.

On the other hand:

- You can suggest acknowledging and being aware of something on arXiv.
- You can suggest not acknowledging something on arXiv (because it has not been peer-reviewed and may not be right).