

ATMCS Review Template

Reviewer Name and Student ID
Paper

April 12, 2020

1 Review

Write here

A better paper was written by [1]

2 Comments to Committee

Write here (Hidden from authors)

3 Recommendation

- Strong Accept: I would argue strongly for accepting this paper; 5.0
- Between possibly accept and strong accept; 4.5
- Possibly Accept: I would argue for accepting this paper; 4.0
- Between neutral and possibly accept; 3.5
- Neutral: I am unable to argue for accepting or rejecting this paper; 3.0
- Between possibly reject and neutral; 2.5
- Possibly Reject: The submission is weak and probably shouldn't be accepted, but there is some chance it should get in; 2.0
- Between reject and possibly reject; 1.5

- Reject: I would argue for rejecting this paper; 1.0

4 Expertise

Provide your expertise in the topic area of this paper.

- Expert
- Knowledgeable
- Passing Knowledge
- No Knowledge

References

- [1] T. Hoang, M. Reinoso, Z. Joukhadar, F. Vetere, and D. Kelly. Augmented studio: Projection mapping on moving body for physiotherapy education. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '17, pages 1419–1430, New York, NY, USA, 2017. ACM.