Summary. * What is the main contribution of this paper? Please provide a brief summary in your own words. Think of your summary as being written for the benefit of the SPC member, area chair, and PC chairs involved with the evaluation of this paper (but your summary will also be read by the authors).

Strengths. * What are the main strengths of this paper? You can be brief here and elaborate under 'detailed comments' below.

Weaknesses. * What are the main weaknesses of this paper? You can be brief here and elaborate under 'detailed comments' below.

Detailed comments. * Please provide a detailed review of the paper. Criteria you may wish to comment on explicitly include relevance, clarity, significance, originality, soundness, reproducibility, scholarship, and presentation. (These reviewing criteria are explained in the FAQ available at https://sites.google.com/view/ecai24faq/pc-members.) Please be as constructive and helpful as you can, independently of whether you expect the paper to get accepted or rejected on this occasion. When citing prior work in your review, always provide full bibliographic details.

Questions for rebuttal. Do you have any concrete questions you would like the authors to answer during the rebuttal phase? If so, please list those questions here. These typically will be clarification questions. Authors should not be expected to respond to points not explicitly listed here. We recommend numbering your questions. Please keep in mind that the author response will be limited to 800 words in total. (This field is optional.)

Score. * Please provide an overall score for this paper (with the implicit understanding that you might want to update your score after having seen the author rebuttal on the basis of the information available to you then). Use the two borderline scores only if you are really unable to provide a clear judgment.

- ○ 10: outstanding (a landmark paper, reporting truly groundbreaking work)
- ○ 9: excellent (top 15% of all accepted papers at top AI conferences over the years)
- ○ 8: very good (top 50% of all accepted papers at top AI conferences over the years)
- ○ 7: good (probably should be accepted)
- ○ 6: borderline (but tending towards acceptance)
- ○ 5: borderline (but tending towards rejection)
- ○ 4: poor (fair attempt but too many concerns, so probably should be rejected)
- ○ 3: very poor (decent attempt but clearly should be rejected)
- ○ 2: insufficient (arguably was not yet ready for submission)
- ○ 1: inadequate (should have been filtered out before the review assignment)

Confidence. * Please assess your confidence in the accuracy of your review. You may wish to take into account both your own level of expertise in the area addressed by the paper and the effort and time you have invested into your review. This self-assessment of your confidence will not be shared with the authors.

- ○ 5: very high
- ○ 4: high
- ○ 3: medium
- ○ 2: low
- ○ 1: very low

Confidential remarks for the programme committee. If you wish to add any confidential remarks intended only for PC members, then please include them here. Your remarks will be seen only by PC members involved in the evaluation of this paper. They will not be shared with the authors. (This field is optional.)