

How to Write a CHI Rebuttal

Eiji Hayashi
Human-Computer Interaction Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

Presented @ WISS 2012 Night Session
Dec. 6th, 2012

Additional Note

I gave this talk at WISS2012 as a part of its night session. Because I wrote them in one hour just before the session, its quality was not as high as I wanted it to be. But, I believe that these slides provide useful insights that are not discussed or shared in Japanese HCI communities. Please feel free to contact me if you have questions and/or comments.

Disclaimer

- Do great research first
- If on the borderline, techniques help
- Not claiming this is the best way
- Not claiming * ($N \approx 20$)
- But, it worked for some cases ^^

When You Get Reviews

- Read reviews
- Wait for a day before starting

If You are Really Lucky (or Unlucky)

- If more than 4.0, say, “We will fix what you asked”
- If less than 2.0, say, “Thank you for your time.”

Neither of Them

- If around 3.5, your rebuttal REALLY matters

Basics

- Reviewers are not enemies
- A rebuttal is not a discussion, it's a dialog
- Stick to facts, not your belief
- Point-by-point
- Touch as many issues as possible

3 Steps of Writing a Rebuttal

1. Split reviews into a collection of single points
2. Write arguments for each point
3. Combine your arguments

3 Steps of Writing a Rebuttal

1. Split reviews into a collection of single points
2. Write arguments for each point
3. Combine your arguments

Flow Chart for Writing Arguments

- Is a reviewer's comments not illogical?
 - Yes: explain politely why it's illogical
 - No: Go to next

- Does the reviewer misinterpret something?
 - Yes: “It was not the case, as written at xxx, it was...”
 - No: Go to next

- Is the issue written in the paper?
 - Yes: “As written at xxx, we agree Rx’s comment. We will make it clearer in the revision.”
 - No: “We admit that Rx’s comment is valid point. We will add discussion in the xxx section.”

Write a Rebuttal

- Combine arguments when multiple reviewers pointed the same issues
- Start from things in a meta-review
 - Convincing AC is most important
(see <http://pages.cpsc.ucalgary.ca/~saul/wiki/pmwiki.php/Personal/PCMeetingProcessDescription>)
- Then, go from R1 to R3

Additional Tips

- Thank reviews first
- At the end, “we will fix all editorial issues as suggested by reviewers”
- Mac (or Unix) vs. Windows
- Make it easy to read
 - Bullet points
 - Start from “Rx inquired ...”
- State good points first (if you have space)
- Promising small changes works
- Touch all reviewers’ comments

Questions?