

The Reviewing Process in Conferences

Fernando Quintão



































The Submission Process

- Author submits paper
- Referees write review
- Author writes rebuttal
- Referees discuss on-line
- If no consensus
 - Chair asks new review
- Referees meet face-to-face
- Author receives notification

1. Are there variations on this process?
2. Who are the referees?

The Program Committee

OOPSLA 2017

 Jonathan Aldrich Program Chair Carnegie Mellon University United States	 Suparna Bhattacharya Hewlett-Packard Enterprise	 Mira Mezini TU Darmstadt Germany	 Ana Milanova Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute United States
 Hans-J. Boehm Google	 Viviana Bono University of Torino Italy	 Heather Miller Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne	 Sasa Misailovic University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA
 Kim Bruce Pomona College	 Jens Dietrich Massey University New Zealand	 Peter Müller ETH Zurich Switzerland	 Sarah Nadi University of Alberta Canada
 Gabriel Dos Reis Texas A&M University and Microsoft	 Irene Finocchi Sapienza University of Rome, Italy Italy	 Erez Petrank Technion	 Gregor Richards University of Waterloo Canada
 Elisa Gonzalez Boix Wijve Universiteit Brussel Belgium	 Kathryn E. Gray University of Cambridge	 Romain Robbes Free University of Bozen-South Tyrol Italy	 Jennifer B. Sartor Software Languages Lab, Wjve Universiteit Brussel Belgium
 Atsushi Igarashi Kyoto University, Japan Japan	 Ciera Jaspán Google	 Joshua Sunshine Carnegie Mellon University	 Tom Van Cutsem Nokia Bell Labs Belgium
 Rezwana Karim Samsung Research America	 Doug Lea State University of New York (SUNY) Oswego United States	 Julien Veraguet Facebook	 Peng Wu Huawei America Research Lab United States
 Shane McIntosh McGill University	 Kathryn S McKinley Microsoft Research	 Lu Zhang Peking University	 Elena Zucca University of Genova

1. Who will review my paper?
2. Why should I care?

The Review

- Short summary
- Strong points
- Weak points
- Current grade
- Questions

	OveMer	Confidence
Review #59A	B	Y
Review #59B	B	Y
Review #59C	A	X

Questions for authors' response

- Why aren't you comparing with library implementations and CPU parallelization?
- This algorithm is expensive. What is the compilation time cost as function of code size?

The Rebuttal

ADDRESSING REVIEWER COMMENTS

BAD REVIEWS ON YOUR PAPER? FOLLOW THESE GUIDELINES AND YOU MAY YET GET IT PAST THE EDITOR:

<p>Reviewer comment: “The method/ device/ paradigm the authors propose is clearly wrong.”</p> <p>How NOT to respond: ✗ “Yes, we know. We thought we could still get a paper out of it. Sorry.”</p> <p>Correct response: ✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, as the focus of this work is exploratory and not performance-based, validation was not found to be of critical importance to the contribution of the paper.”</p>	<p>Reviewer comment: “The authors fail to reference the work of Smith et al., who solved the same problem 20 years ago.”</p> <p>How NOT to respond: ✗ “Huh. We didn’t think anybody had read that. Actually, their solution is better than ours.”</p> <p>Correct response: ✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, our work is based on completely different first principles (we use different variable names), and has a much more attractive graphical user interface.</p>	<p>Reviewer comment: “This paper is poorly written and scientifically unsound. I do not recommend it for publication.”</p> <p>How NOT to respond: ✗ “You #&@*% reviewer! I know who you are! I’m gonna get you when it’s my turn to review!”</p> <p>Correct response: ✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, we feel the reviewer did not fully comprehend the scope of the work, and misjudged the results based on incorrect assumptions.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

www.phdcomics.com

JORGE CHAM © 2005

- Stick to facts
- Don't advertise the paper
- Ask the chair if you don't know what is appropriate

On-Line Discussion

- Referees try to reach a consensus.
- If there is a champion, he will defend the paper.

Comment 3	
PC member:	[REDACTED]
Comment:	You are right that we should give the authors the benefit of doubt. It is a good idea to send a message describing what we believe would be the correct behavior without supposing they have acted in bad faith.
Time:	Jun 20, 20:31

Comment 4	
PC member:	[REDACTED]
Comment:	[REDACTED] am waiting for your input on this one.
Time:	Jun 21, 18:36

Comment 5	
PC member:	[REDACTED]
Comment:	[REDACTED] eu não acho que esse artigo deva ser aceito. Há texto igual na publicação anterior, que é indexada em várias bibliotecas digitais. Os autores nem ao menos citam aquele trabalho. Existem sim diferenças, mas são poucas para justificar a publicação em uma conferência.
Time:	Jun 21, 18:51

Comment 6	
PC member:	[REDACTED]
Comment:	Ok, [REDACTED] am marking this as "REJECT". I will be sending the notification on friday, if any of you want to amend your reviews please do it by the end of thursday. Thanks, everyone.
Time:	Jun 21, 20:03

Face-to-Face Discussion

- Program Committee gets together
- Borderline papers are discussed
- If there is a champion, then he/she defends paper
- Occasionally, a shepherd can be assigned to the paper

Do you know what's a shepherd?

