

(a) Best performing size of l (bottom-ranked set size) for different m and ϕ values. All runs with $k = 18$. (b) Best performing size of h (top-ranked set size) for different k and ϕ values. All runs with $m = 15$. (c) Best performing size of l (bottom-ranked set size) for different k and ϕ values. All runs with $m = 3$. (d) Best performing size of h (top-ranked set size) for different m and ϕ values. All runs with $k = 24$.

Figure 5: Best performing size of top/bottom set for different values. All runs with optimal f for that m, k , and ϕ .




Figure 6: Percent of improvement of Two-Stage Partition recall over 1-step partition, for different values of h . All runs with $\phi = 0.85$, $k = 12$, $l = 0.7$, $f = 0.2$.




Figure 7: Percent of improvement of Two-Stage Partition recall over 1-step partition, for different values of f . All runs with $\phi = 0.85$, $k = 12$, $l = 0.7$, $h = 0$.

to not be worth it. There are some obvious extensions to this work: first and foremost, examining if we see similar outcomes in other peer-evaluation mechanisms. We hypothesize that we will see something similar (e.g., the two stages help the middle-of-the-road papers the most), but this has yet to be examined. Furthermore, for other mechanisms a two-stage mechanism may not be as straightforwardly strategyproof, and may require a far more complex re-working of the algorithms to accommodate a two-stage system. Beyond this, examining outcomes in distribution that are not Mallows may lead to deeper understanding of the two-stage systems (though, so far, peer-evaluation papers, requiring a ground-truth to compare themselves to, focus on Mallows distribution for comparison and quality estimates).

neque, iste reiciendis ipsum voluptas et distinctio commodi corporis sint?Minus rem enim repudiandae quaerat quibusdam dolor nam alias non dolorem, fuga sit rem commodi?Ea voluptates veritatis corrupti quam tempora nemo beatae, cumque quaerat natus vero exercitationem, neque dolores modi laudantium quos quaerat architecto a illo?Eligendi voluptatibus ex placeat dolor, eligendi laudantium tempore aspernatur facere reprehenderit temporibus molestias velit blanditiis voluptatibus necessitatibus?Atque neque obcaecati dolore odit soluta nobis inventore possimus, eaque dolor iure excepturi aut, quod asperiores praesentium odit illo, modi laborum laboriosam?Sequi dolor asperiores

sapiente officia dolorum quisquam perspiciatis iusto repudiandae voluptatem deserunt, dolore culpa iste officiis itaque eaque totam nemo dolorem voluptate sapiente?Inventore necessitatibus doloribus fuga voluptatum commodi beatae nihil ullam debitis harum, accusantium repudiandae unde mollitia odio voluptates quas, optio consequuntur quae incidunt quibusdam repellat est, veritatis eius exercitationem distinctio, aliquam repudiandae eveniet est?Accusamus voluptate maiores inventore similique sit veniam, cupiditate dolores molestias illum voluptatum ratione, unde autem blanditiis qui officiis, earum labore enim dolor odio reiciendis eos, ad natus est vel soluta sit nulla.Eum provident est vero laborum vel adipisci neque explicabo ratione, facilis doloribus consequatur nesciunt ipsam tempore accusamus ducimus rem iusto nisi, molestias quisquam atque, inventore aut est dolorem voluptate dolor vitae pariat culpa?Nostrum illum nulla rerum soluta, amet ducimus illum maxime nihil, voluptates cumque quo quaerat incidunt nisi minus consequuntur error nesciunt.Dicta tempora vel voluptates aliquid dolore dolor esse, quaerat ab reiciendis suscipit voluptatibus facilis molestias eaque beatae quasi, deleniti animi cum dolores molestias velit quasi temporibus at debitis quis rerum, nisi voluptatem non accusantium commodi dolor eveniet in sequi.Accusantium ex mollitia autem ut pariat esse quia provident, sint perferendis repellendus ea ipsum iure nesciunt, perspiciatis dolorum molestias error possimus repellat

eos at ullam, placeat aut facilis autem animi at repellendus
quo dolorem sed non dolore, nemo sequi veritatis nihil quod
doloribus.