Dear Author,

Thank you very much for your submission

```
'Anonymous Paper'
```

We are sorry to inform you that your paper was rejected. The venue received a great many submissions of high quality. Each submission was thoroughly and extensively reviewed by our expert panels. After week-long online and offline discussions, we selected a small subset of papers to be accepted. Unfortunately, your paper was not one of them.

We have enclosed detailed reviews of your paper below. We hope that these will help you in your scientific work and look forward to your future submissions!

Reviewer 2

Generally speaking, this is interesting work which may well find some readers in the community. However, in its present form, the paper suffers from a number of issues, which are outlined below.

Abstract

This paper, titled 'Anonymous Paper,' one more time addresses the problem of Anonymity in SIGBOVIK. The approach is novel, and is well-described in the paper. Yet, it is only incremental with respect to the state of the art. This especially holds when compared against the latest works of Anonymous Author. The approach is shown to work only in theory; but despite its obvious limitations, it is shown to have potential under specific circumstances.

Area

SIGBOVIK is not new. The past decade has seen a flurry of papers in the area, which would indicate progress and interest. However, the impact *outside* of SIGBOVIK has been very limited, as is easily reflected in the ever-decreasing number of citations. Unfortunately, SIGBOVIK finds itself in a sandwich position between a more theoretical community and a more practical community, which can both claim a bigger intellectual challenge and a greater relevance in practical settings. This is especially true for the field of Anonymity, where the last big progress is now decades ago. As refreshing it feels to finally again see progress claimed in the field, the present paper must be read and evaluated in this context.

Originality

The central problem of the paper is its novelty with respect to related work. Just last month, this reviewer attended a talk on Anonymous Paper by Anonymous Author at Anonymous Institution where a very similar solution to the exact same problem was presented. The paper is actually online at

```
http://scigen.csail.mit.edu/cgi-bin/scigen.cgi?author=Anonymous%20Author
```

Please relate your work carefully against this existing work, precisely highlighting the advances.

Approach

The approach is novel in the sense that the exact same approach has not been examined before.

A central problem with the approach is that the difference with respect to earlier work is simply too small. An incremental approach such as this one may be appreciated in practice, as it may easily integrate into existing processes; but for a research paper, the community expects bigger leaps.

The paper suffers from an excess of formalism. Several important definitions are introduced formally only, without a chance to clearly understand their motivation or usage. The authors should be encouraged to make more use of informal definitions, building on the well-established formal definitions in the community.

It is good to see the approach scale to real-life settings. The price of scalability, however, is having to cope with a multitude of details, which the paper only glosses over, without ever providing a complete picture. The authors would be better served to provide a tangible abstraction of their approach; maybe it only works in limited settings, but at least, for these, we can understand how and why.

The authors should be happy to see their approach being used outside of academia. However, this challenges the novelty of the present submission: Not only is the approach is no longer superior to the state of the art, it even is not longer superior to the state of the practice - ironically, because it now defines what the current state of practice is. The submission had better be framed as an experience report and target non-academic readers.

Evaluation

As nice as it is to see the approach defined and its properties discussed, it *has* to be evaluated whether it works on actual subjects. Without a detailed evaluation, we can never know whether the claimed properties also hold under less abstract and less favorable circumstances.

Limitations

The section on 'threats to validity' pretty much sums everything up: The approach cannot claim external validity (no surprise, given the evaluation results); on top, *the authors themselves* list

important threats to internal and construct validity.

The fact that the authors themselves apparently cannot list future work fits into this very picture. This is a clear indication of work being stuck in an impasse; if one ever needed a living proof how Anonymity has become the laughingstock of the SIGBOVIK community, or how SIGBOVIK is more and more becoming a dead branch of science, here it is. With so many threats and limitations, it is unclear whether the paper can be published at all, even in a thoroughly revised form.

Reproducibility

Your code and data are not available as open source. Being unavailable for the general public, there is no way for readers (or this reviewer) to validate your claims, which is a strict requirement for a scientific contribution. Please submit it as an electronic appendix with the next revision.

Presentation

The typography of your paper is a disgrace. Respect the style instructions as given by the publisher. Respect paper lengths. Do not cheat with super-small fonts. Learn what good typography is. Learn how to use LaTeX, and how to use LaTeX properly. Do not use multi-letter identifiers in LaTeX math mode. Distinguish - (hyphen) between elements of compound words, -- (en-dash) in ranges, $-$ (minus) for math, --- (em-dash) for digressions in a sentence. use the correct quotes (`` and "). In BibTeX, capitalize titles properly. Use \dots rather than ... . This reviewer stops here.

The paper has numerous presentation issues. The paper contains numerous typos - Page 2, for instance, has a period '.' instead of a comma ','. This is a sign of careless proofreading, and ultimately disrespect - if the authors do not care about their paper, why should the reader care? At least *try* to produce a polished version for submission.

Keep in mind that a high number of presentation issues eventually will hinder the readers and reviewers to understand what your work is about. Should you find misunderstandings in the above review, ask yourself what you could have done to avoid these.

Summary

Points in favor: (+) An interesting approach to Anonymity in SIGBOVIK (+) Paper does a good attempt at describing the approach

Points against: (-) Far away from scientific mainstream (-) Incremental (-) Insufficient evaluation (-) Substantial presentation issues

Recommendation

Reject.

Footnote

Generated by autoreject.org