

Date: [Insert Date]

To: [Corresponding Author's Name]

Manuscript ID: [Paper ID]

Title: [Paper Title]

Dear [Author(s) Name],

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to [Conference Name]. After a thorough peer-review process, we regret to inform you that your paper will not be included in the conference program. Please find below a detailed explanation of the decision, along with reviewer summaries and recommendations to help you understand the feedback and improve your work for future submissions.

#### Reason for Rejection:

- **Novelty:** The contribution was deemed incremental and insufficiently distinct from prior work.
- **Significance:** Reviewers agreed the presented findings currently have limited impact on the field and would benefit from further development.
- **Clarity:** Certain sections, including methodology and results, lacked adequate detail for full reproducibility and understanding.
- **Technical correctness:** Some aspects of your approach and evaluation were identified as unclear or not fully justified.

Please refer to the detailed reviewer summaries below for more specific feedback.

#### Reviewer Summaries:

##### Reviewer 1:

- **Strengths:** The paper addresses a relevant problem and demonstrates a good grasp of related literature.
- **Areas for Improvement:** The experimental evaluation lacks statistical significance, and comparison with state-of-the-art approaches is insufficient.
- **Suggestions:** Include more comprehensive benchmarking and a discussion of limitations to enhance credibility.

##### Reviewer 2:

- **Strengths:** The problem statement is well-focused and the proposed solution is interesting.
- **Areas for Improvement:** Some technical details are missing, particularly about data preprocessing and parameter settings.
- **Suggestions:** Expand the methods section for clarity and consider providing supplementary materials or code to support reproducibility.

##### Reviewer 3:

- **Strengths:** The writing is clear and the introduction is engaging.
- **Areas for Improvement:** The theoretical foundation could be strengthened, and some claims lack supporting evidence.
- **Suggestions:** Re-examine the assumptions underlying your approach and provide empirical or theoretical support for key assertions.

#### Next Steps:

1. Thoroughly address reviewers' feedback and consider how to strengthen your manuscript in the areas raised above.
2. Seek additional input from colleagues or mentors before resubmission.
3. Explore alternative venues or conferences that align closely with the focus of your work.

We appreciate your interest in [Conference Name] and encourage you to submit future work. We hope the comments herein assist you in further developing your research.

Sincerely,  
[Program Chair Name]  
[Conference Name] Program Committee