

Quadruple-Blind Peer Review

Yuriko Shū

Abstract

This paper proposes a quadruple-blind peer review process to minimise bias during the review process. In 2020, SIGBOVIK introduced the triple-blind peer review process, aiming to further reduce bias than the double-blind review process, which is widely used in academia. The author identifies further room for improvement and proposes an improved process of quadruple-blind reviewing. By adding another phase of blinding, the program committee is expected to be more unlikely to guess the identity of authors, thus reducing potential bias.

1 Introduction

The quadruple-blind peer review process is as follows:

In addition to the current triple-blind reviewing process, another phase of *author response* (also known as *rebuttal*) is added. During this phase, the authors are expected to submit a response, *without* learning the review.

The program committee can then consider (1) the anonymised paper, (2) the anonymised review, and (3) the anonymised author response in deciding whether to accept a paper or not.

2 The Need for Author Response

The existence of author response phase aims to provide the authors with an opportunity to address questions or comments raised by reviewers, typical examples include:

- Pointing out typos, whilst leaving plenty of typos in the review.
- Asking authors to cite certain papers for comparison.
- Mean words that make authors feel worthless.
- Asking for an implementation of a theoretical paper.
- Technical questions that are irrelevant to the paper.
- Difficult questions like $P=NP$.
- Actual relevant questions regarding the paper. (rare)

The authors sometimes feel the need to answer these questions, or basically pointing out the Reviewer #2 is being an asshole for no obvious reason.

Alternatively, they may decide to include additional materials in the author response phase, so that they would put some results that they produced after the deadline has passed, or that they could not add to the main paper at the time of submission due to the page limit.

Most importantly, it is a posh thing to have an author response phase, as many conferences nowadays do. In addition, the author response period also provides professors with creative ways to torture their poor PhD students, or maybe postdocs as well.

3 Related Work and Conclusion

At the best knowledge of the author, the quadruple-blind peer review process is novel and has not been applied to any academic venue of publication. The author wishes the organisers of SIGBOVIK could consider the adoption of this proposal in the next year's conference.

SIGBOVIK is a pilot in computer science publishing venues, having adopted the bleeding edge triple-blind reviewing process. The author therefore believes the quadruple-blind reviewing process would further improve the quality of papers published.

Acknowledgements

We thank anonymous reviewers for their comments and feedback. In particular, we would like to thank reviewer #1 for their helpful insight.

A Author Response

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments; however, the author is disappointed by the reviewer #2, whose review did not add much value to the improvement of this paper.

A.1 Motivation of Author Response

In section 2 of the paper, we detail on why the author feels that the author response phase is needed. The reviewer #2 mentioned that there is no motivation, the author respectfully disagrees, and invites the reviewer to read section 2.

A.2 Comparison with Quintuple-Blind Review

The author would like to thank the reviewer #3 for pointing out the latest work on the quintuple-blind review process. However, this work is still in a draft form, and is initially published after the deadline of the paper submission. The author was therefore unable to include this work in the related work section.

A.3 Typos

The author would like to point out that *organise* is not wrongly spelt. The English language, as spoken by the residents in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, does consider *organise* as the correct spelling of the word.