

From: Christian Fischer Pedersen <cfp@es.aau.dk>
Date: 14 May 2008 6:17:08 AM
To: David Davies <dave.davies@canberra.edu.au>
Subject: ITRW Aalborg 2008 - Review result of revised conditionally accepted paper: **Accept - Paper no. 44**

Dear ITRW Aalborg 2008 Author,

We are pleased to announce that your paper has been accepted for ITRW Aalborg 2008.

At the end of this mail, your paper details and reviewers' comments are enclosed. Your paper will be included in the ITRW proceedings when at least one of the authors has registered for the workshop. All the needed information, e.g. about registration, can be found on the workshop's web-site: <http://www.es.aau.dk/itrw>. Please note the early registration deadline.

At the workshop you will be given approx. 30 minutes to present your paper orally, i.e. approx. 20 minutes for presentation and approx. 10 minutes for discussion. As this is a workshop and not a regular conference, the discussion part is important, and it is highly appreciated if you can help facilitate the discussion pertaining to your paper and presentation.

Details with regard to the exact time slot of your presentation will be presented in the final workshop programme which will be published on the workshop web-site as soon as possible. A representative provisional workshop programme has already been published on the web site.

Once again, thank you for contributing to ITRW Aalborg 2008!
We look forward to seeing you and your colleagues at Aalborg University, Denmark.
If you have any comments or questions, do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,
The Organising Committee
Web-site: <http://www.es.aau.dk/itrw>
Email: itrw_aalborg_2008@es.aau.dk

=====
PAPER DETAILS

=====
PAPER TITLE: Innovative acoustic probes to test predictions of wider utterance context
PAPER ID: 44

Note: If the paper details do not match your paper, please inform us as soon as possible.

=====

=====

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

=====

Comments to authors:

Thank you for revising your paper to address the concerns raised in the original review.

Comments to authors:

The paper has substantially improved in terms of clarity and informativeness of the figures. Given the limitations of a 4-pages workshop contribution, the focus is now acceptable.

=====