

What a Task Reviewer scores

Five scores per task after the multi-round discussion, each justified in a written review with a confidence (1–5). Highlighted scores are an example.

1 OVERALL RATING · PUBLICATION POTENTIAL

Would the result merit a Nature-family journal?

journal's acceptance threshold →

example



1 trivial or wrong

below above

10 top 5%, seminal

Assume it succeeds; weigh

novelty

significance

validation

Explain · name the journal and the paper's central contribution.

2 NOVELTY

What could it add beyond prior work?

5 Substantial discovery

4 Clear: fills a gap

3 Meaningful

2 Limited: incremental

1 None: reproduction

Explain · the closest prior work.

3 SIGNIFICANCE

What would the field gain?

5 Major: advances the field

4 Strong: key problem

3 Meaningful: useful

2 Limited: narrow

1 Little contribution

Explain · what the field could learn.

4 OPEN-ENDEDNESS

Is one number enough to judge it?

☒ Yes: a scalar misses it

☐ Partly: needs judgment too

☐ No: a scalar is adequate

☐ Cannot assess

Explain · what a scalar would miss.

5 FEASIBILITY

How hard is the objective itself?



← moonshot

low-hanging fruit →

Higher = easier; scored apart from 1–3.

Explain · the main obstacles.