



Debanjan Mahata <dxmahata@ualr.edu>

[IJCAI2013] Information for discussion phase

1 message

Francesca Rossi <frossi@math.unipd.it>
Reply-To: Francesca Rossi <frossi@math.unipd.it>
To: Debanjan Mahata <dxmahata@ualr.edu>

Fri, Mar 8, 2013 at 4:13 PM

Dear IJCAI 2013 PC member,

The author feedback phase has finished and we move now to the discussion phase. This will last until MARCH 20.
If you login to ConfMaster, go to View Assigned Papers, and then click on a D button, you will be able to read all reviews and author feedback for the papers assigned to you.
Let me remind you your login credential for <http://ijcai2013.confmaster.net>:
login: dxmahata
password: ROOMNO122

If you login to ConfMaster, you will be able to read the reviews as well as any feedback written by the authors, for the papers assigned to you.

Your role is now:

- to actively participate in the discussion
- to make sure that all reviews by you are polite, fair, constructive and of high quality
- to revise your reviews to take into account the author's feedback

The Area Chair assigned to a paper will be responsible for initiating and supervising the discussion, as well as to recommend to me whether to accept or reject the paper in light of the discussion.

Some important information to help you in the discussion phase:

-- HIGH QUALITY AND CONSTRUCTIVE REVIEWS

Please make sure that your reviews are of high quality. They should be polite, not aggressive nor disrespectful, neutral, and constructive. If for some reason your review does not meet this criteria, please revise it.

-- PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE DISCUSSION

Each paper has been assigned to 1 AC, 3 Senior PC members, who in turn could either review it themselves or ask one of their PC members to do it. This means that the discussion about a paper will involve 1 AC, 3 SPC members, and at most 3 PC members.

-- REVIEW REVISION

Please consider revising your review in light of the feedback and discussion. It would be great if your review had a new section added which is entitled: 'Comments added after the author feedback'. Even if you believe your criticisms stand, please update your review to take account of the authors' feedback. For instance, say why their response is not adequate. As an author myself, I know how frustrating it can be to read reviews where the reviewers appear to have ignored my replies.

-- POSTER VS ORAL PRESENTATIONS

All accepted papers will have the same length in the proceedings. However, during the conference days, some will be presented with an oral presentation (and a poster), while others will be presented only as a poster. Posters should not be for papers of lower quality, but rather for papers whose content is less suitable for being appreciated with a 20' presentation to a large audience, and would be better communicated to a few people in a more interactive environment.

Each review includes the recommendation for poster or oral presentation. You may find it as the rightmost criteria (after confidence), called 'Oral pres.'. Unfortunately I could not have yes/no written there, but only numbers, so you either see a 1 (means no, that is, NOT recommended for oral presentation) or a 10 (means yes, that is, recommended for oral presentation).

Please use this information, as well as what comes out of the discussion, to discuss whether to recommend the paper for oral or poster presentation.

-- MISSING REVIEWS

I have done my best to solicit missing review in the past weeks. However, a few reviews are still missing. If you are one of those who failed to deliver some of the reviews, please upload them as soon as possible, so they can be used in the discussion.

-- TWO TYPES OF SUBMISSIONS

We have two tracks: main one and computational sustainability.

There are technical papers (6+1 pages), submitted to both tracks,

and data challenge papers (3 pages), only for the computational sustainability track.

Data challenge papers should be treated differently, since they serve a different purpose (please look at the call for papers).

-- PAPERS NOT RESPECTING THE RULES AND POLICIES

Some papers have been already summary rejected by me, for example for violation of the anonymity policy or for being double submissions. However, there may still be papers that violate these or other rules, such as the format requirements. Technical papers should be 6 pages plus at most 1 page of references, while data challenge papers should be 3 pages. I trust the judgement of the AC in charge of a paper in enforcing all these rules. However, if you think you need advice from me, feel free to ask.

-- ACCEPTANCE RATE

There is no fixed number, nor a fixed percentage, of papers that should be accepted.

However, for example, in 2007 around 34% of submissions were accepted (about 50% as papers and 50% as posters).

You should treat such percentages as indicative, since decisions should be made on quality alone.

-- CONFMASER TERMINOLOGY

Remember that the ConfMaster terminology is different from ours: Area Chairs are called Primary PC members, Senior PC members are called Secondary PC members, and PC members are called Reviewers.

If you have any doubts, or need help or advice, feel free to ask me.

Best regards,

Francesca Rossi
IJCAI 2013 Program Chair

////////////////////////////////////
Powered by ConfMaster.net
////////////////////////////////////