Review Form

The form itself is shown below.

Contribution. * Briefly summarize what you consider to be the main contribution(s) of this work. This is not the place to critique the paper; the authors should generally agree with a well-written summary. This is also not the place to paste the abstract—please provide the summary in your own understanding after reading.

Relevance to ANTS. * Please rate the relevance of this work to the field of swarm intelligence, considering the research areas listed on https://ants2026.org.

- ○ excellent
- ○ good
- ○ fair
- ○ poor

Originality. * Please rate the originality of the work, considering whether it provides new insights, clearly distinguishes itself from prior research, and introduces or justifies new methods or combinations of existing techniques.

- ○ excellent
- ○ good
- ○ fair
- ○ poor

Technical Quality. * Please rate the technical quality of the work, considering its technical soundness, reproducibility, the support for its claims, the appropriateness of its methods, and the fairness of its evaluation of strengths and weaknesses.

- ○ excellent
- ○ good
- ○ fair
- ○ poor

Significance. * Please rate the significance of the work, considering its impact on the community, the likelihood that others will use or build on it, and whether it demonstrably advances understanding or addresses a difficult task better than previous work.

- ○ excellent
- ○ good
- ○ fair
- ○ poor

Presentation Quality. * Please rate the presentation quality, considering the clarity of the writing, the organization of the content, and how well it informs the reader.

- ○ excellent
- ○ good
- ○ fair
- ○ poor

Strengths. * Please provide a thorough assessment of the strengths of the paper, explicitly addressing the aspects of relevance to ANTS, originality, technical quality, significance, and presentation quality.

Weaknesses. * Please provide a thorough assessment of the weaknesses of the paper, explicitly addressing the aspects of relevance to ANTS, originality, technical quality, significance, and presentation quality.

Feedback for Improvement. * Please provide specific and constructive feedback for improving this work.

Overall Evaluation. * Please provide an overall rating for this submission.

- ○ strong accept
- ○ accept
- ○ weak accept
- ○ borderline paper
- ○ weak reject
- ○ reject
- ○ strong reject

Reviewer's Confidence. * Please provide a confidence rating for your assessment of this submission to indicate how confident you are in your evaluation, based on your expertise and understanding of the topic.

- ○ expert
- ○ high
- ○ medium
- ○ low
- ○ none

Supplementary Video. Please rate the video submission and provide feedback for improving it. If no video was submitted, please select "No video submission".

- ○ excellent
- ○ good
- ○ fair
- ○ poor
- ○ No video submission

Confidential Remarks for the Program Committee. If you wish to add any remarks intended only for PC members please write them below. These remarks will only be seen by the PC members having access to reviews for this submission. They will not be sent to the authors. This field is optional.

Best Paper Award. Would you nominate this submission for the Best Paper Award? If so, please provide a brief justification.

- ○ yes
- ○ no

Attachment. If your review is in a non-text format, for example, a PDF file, upload it here:

Datei auswählen Keine ausgewählt