# Rebuttals

Omar Alonso

# What is it?

- Authors have a chance to provide a rebuttal in response to reviews
- Goal is to make clarifications and to answer some key questions
- No additional content is considered in a rebuttal
  - In a journal submission you can revise the content
  - This is a one-way communication
- Final decision will take rebuttal into consideration
- Does it help?

# Different flavors

- Depends on the conference
- Text limit is 600-800 words
- Optional
- You cannot provide new content and/or modified version of the paper

# Main goals

- Clarify any issues and errors

- Commit to make the required changes and other improvements

- Convince the reviewers that you are technically capable to making those changes

# Things to consider

- Do we need to write one?

- Be polite but firm

- Group similar feedback

- Address all issues
  - Don't ignore a particular point or reviewer
  - Be respectful

- Be concise and to the point

- Do not complain to Program Chairs, vent on Twitter, etc.

# Two personal examples – WWW'22

We thank all of the reviewers for their helpful comments.

We appreciated that all 3 reviewers scored our originality as "creative", scored our expected impact as "broad", and commented on problem significance: "determining inter-annotator agreement for complex annotations is important" (R1), "very interesting problem of annotators' agreement" (R2), and "The paper focuses on a key problem" (R3). Reviewers also affirmed that: (R1), "points to weaknesses of existing methods" (R2), and "existing measures such as Krippendorff's agreement measures are not appropriate" (R3).

While 2/3 of reviewers scored our presentation as "reasonable", all reviewers offered valuable suggestions for improvement, which we will address in our final version:

-R1: "I find it difficult to follow this part (Table 1 and Section 6.2)." and "a narrative style… makes it a bit hard for the readers to get the core messages. Some adjustments in how the paper is structured could be used."

-R2: "A more expansive "Discussion" on the method" and further "thoughts on the method"

-R3: "illustrating the issues and also the solutions" and "discussion on interpretability is vague".

Secondly, R1 writes that "it's unclear what 1) each of the distance functions mentioned in Table 1 are, 2) the intuition is behind the "expected" order within a set of distance functions."

Regarding 1), we cited sources that include the function definitions in order to save space, but we understand this reduces readability of our paper; we will add these definitions from cited prior work to the appendix in our final version.

# Two personal examples – WWW'23

We thank all of the reviewers for their helpful comments.

While 3/4 of reviewers scored our presentation as excellent/good, all reviewers offered valuable suggestions for improvement:

- R1&R2 (calculation errors, typos, remark2 and k-sentences).

- R3 and meta (out of scope).

- R2 (KBC accuracy and triplet accuracy).

- R2 (model update).

1. We identified a few errors and we'll fix them in the final version.

2. In the CFP, the "Health on the Web" section mentions "Web-related computer science with direct benefits to the medical and health domains" and "advances in health, utilizing existing state-of-the-art computational techniques." Our work fits the track. CORE KB is an advancement for online decision support systems as it can drive confident healthcare decisions. We will better frame our work in the track context by describing the application of CORE in Web-based precision medicine, stating its role in online health communities.

3. In terms of performance, we are competitive with SOTA healthcare KBC methods (e.g., [8,19,23]). CORE is more robust and general than [23]. In KB/reconstruction (Table 8), CORE demonstrates >95% accuracy in recovering BioXpress annotations, whereas DEXTER (best available SOTA), achieves only 32% accuracy on the largest dataset we used for evaluation (DS2). Regarding triplet accuracy details, we will add them to the paper.

# Links

- M. Morris on rebuttal guide and tips: http://aka.ms/rebuttals
- N. Elmqvist https://sites.umiacs.umd.edu/elm/2016/11/19/writing-rebuttals/
- K. McKingley https://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/mckinley/notes/blind.html