

IISWC 2020 PC Meeting

Welcome!

August 14, 2020

Key Statistics

Record number of submissions (total 70)!
(one withdrawn during review cycle)


Number of submissions in previous years
IISWC 2019: 45 IISWC 2018: 47

Number of reviews per paper: 5 (target)

Success rate: ~97%

Key Statistics

Paper Breakdown By Topic areas



Key Statistics

Supplemental Information on Revision

One: visibility chosen to be the PC

Paper Type

Regular 48

Tools/Benchmarks 16

Undeclared 6 (2 Regular? + 4 Tools/Benchmarks?)

Author Breakdown (papers co-authored by)

Academia ~64 Industry ~12

National Labs/Govt. Research Labs ~17

This Year's Rating Range

Overall merit

- 1. Strong Reject
- 2. Reject
- 3. Weak accept
- 4. Accept
- 5. Strong accept

A typical weak-reject rating was missing to favor positive reviewing.

an average Overall merit score of 2.73. ([details](#) · [graphs](#))

Is it helpful in increasing the fraction of the papers to be accepted with common consensus?

Paper Tags / Groups

Group online-accept Total 12 papers (~17%)
any paper with all positive ratings (score ≥ 3)

Overall merit

- 1.** Strong Reject
- 2.** Reject
- 3.** Weak accept
- 4.** Accept
- 5.** Strong accept

Group online-reject Total 23 papers (~33%)

Type-one members: any paper which has majority of negative reviews (three reviews with score ≤ 2).

Type-two members: any paper with only two negative reviews but does not have any full accept or higher (score ≥ 4) rating. We do not seem to have a champion.

Paper Tags / Groups

Group C Total 15 papers (~22%)

any paper with exactly one negative review
(either a reject or a strong reject).

Overall merit

- 1. Strong Reject
- 2. Reject
- 3. Weak accept
- 4. Accept
- 5. Strong accept

Group D Total 19 papers (~28%)

Type-one members: any paper with exactly two negative reviews.

Type-two members: any paper with three or more negative reviews but has at least one full accept or higher ($score \geq 4$) rating. We may have a champion.

No target acceptance rate!

Our focus should be on building a strong technical program that grows our community and increases IISWC's readership!

Cheat Sheet

- Abstracts
- Authors (deblinded)
- Full author info
- Row numbers

- PC conflicts
- Review preferences
- Reviewers
- Tags
 - #~accept report
 - #~reject report
- Discussion leads

- Scores:**
- Overall merit
 - Novelty
 - Reviewer expertise
- Sort by: [?](#)
- [Edit formulas](#)

Override conflicts

[Search](#)

[Advanced search](#)

[Saved searches](#)

[View options](#)

#online-accept

in

[Advanced search](#)

[Saved searches](#)

[View options](#)

#Group-C OR #Group-D

in


[Advanced search](#)

[Saved searches](#)

[View options](#)

Review # Reviews OveMer Nov RevExp

5/6



5



Discussion Order

#discuss in Submitted papers

[Advanced search](#) [Saved searches](#) [View options](#)

4 online-accepts out of 12 (5 mins each) $4 \times 5\text{mins} = 20\text{mins}$

3 Group-D papers out of 19 (5 mins each) $3 \times 5\text{mins} = 15\text{mins}$

Calibration

Discussion Order

#discuss in Submitted papers

[Advanced search](#) [Saved searches](#) [View options](#)

4 online-accepts out of 12 (5 mins each) $4 \times 5\text{mins} = 20\text{mins}$

3 Group-D papers out of 19 (5 mins each) $3 \times 5\text{mins} = 15\text{mins}$

15 Group-C papers (10 mins each) $15 \times 10\text{mins} = 150\text{mins}$

Randomized order; may be broken into two parts

Discussion Order

#discuss in Submitted papers [Search](#)

[Search](#) [Advanced search](#) [Saved searches](#) [View options](#)

4 online-accepts out of 12 (5 mins each) $4 \times 5\text{mins} = 20\text{mins}$

3 Group-D papers out of 19 (5 mins each) $3 \times 5\text{mins} = 15\text{mins}$

15 Group-C papers (10 mins each) $15 \times 10\text{mins} = 150\text{mins}$

Rest of Group-D papers (10 mins each) as many as we please

Randomized order; can be prioritized (see next slide)

Discussion Order

Any PC member who reviewed a particular paper can ask to discuss it from Group-D, online-reject, and not-discussed online-accept groups.

Please send a private chat message to both the PC chairs to declare your intent -- you will be the discussion lead.

All tags are tentative until a paper has been discussed or the PC meeting has ended (whichever happens first).

Paper Discussion Steps

Moderated by one of the PC chairs:

Odd paper numbers: Devesh Tiwari

Even paper numbers: David Kaeli

Conflict handling and scribe: Tirthak Patel + PC chairs

Paper discussion is kicked off by the discussion lead. Short summary – arguing why it should be accepted? [Discussion lead is responsible for writing the PC summary.](#)

A Few Remarks

Focus on the key ideas, insights, and approach

Not on the magnitude of improvement over the last year's published technique!

Thought-provoking vs. “safe” papers

Welcome risky, thought-provoking papers

Paper length or paper type (tool vs. regular)

Same standards

A Few Remarks

Incremental novelty

Please provide a reference. Let us not expect authors to provide quantitative superiority over every state-of-the-art technique we can find.

Comparison with other submitted papers

We should judge each paper individually.

Online voting Setup in Hotcrp (top left corner)

No compulsion to change your rating/review unless you want to!

Other FAQs

Shepherding/conditional accepts: not in use

PC summary:

absolutely important; please use our templates.

Feedback for rejected papers is equally or more
important than determining which papers to accept!

Meeting breaks: Opportunistically (when you can
without us noticing it ;-).


Handling conflict and using zoom chat

If you are stuck in the waiting room, have connection difficulty, etc., email the submission chair: Tirthak Patel (patel.ti@northeastern.edu)

PC chairs may not be monitoring their email box.

Use the “zoom chat” feature, but be careful.
It is best not to broadcast a message about a particular paper!

Finally, everyone is welcome to join...



... don't be apologetic, please!

PC Summary Templates

PC Summary Template: Accepted Papers

Thank you for submitting your work to IISWC'20.

Congratulations! [This paper was discussed at the PC meeting and was accepted to appear in the proceedings. Note: if a paper was discussed at PC meeting and the outcome of decided via PC-wide voting. Please mention that in the PC summary, but do not mention the vote count.]

The reviewers identified multiple positives: The reviewers also recognized multiple areas of improvement:

The PC strongly encourages authours to incoporate the feedback from the reviewers as they prepare the camera-ready version. We look forward to your presentation at IISWC'20!

PC Summary Template: Rejected Papers

Thank you for submitting your work to IISWC'20.

[This paper was discussed at the PC meeting and was not accepted to appear in the proceedings. Note: if a paper was discussed at PC meeting and the outcome of decided via PC-wide voting. Please mention that in the PC summary, but do not mention the vote count.]

The reviewers identified multiple positives: However, the reviewers also raised multiple serious concerns that prohibited the PC to accept this paper. In particular, [Be sure to mention all identified concerns].

[If a particular technical weakness was discussed more extensively and was considered more serious, please mention that explicitly.]

The PC hopes that the feedback from individual is useful toward making the paper stronger for future submissions . We look forward to your participation at IISWC'20!

Post-meeting notes

Summary

The PC meeting lasted around 500 mins (over 8 hours) to accept 28 papers out of 70 submissions.

All papers in the Group C and Group D were discussed.

Avg. discussion time for each paper was ~12 minutes. The paper which took the longest before reaching its final outcome was discussed for ~21 mins and the quickest one was decided in ~5 mins.

The final outcome was reached after extensive technical discussion and not merely based on the average review score of the paper. In cases when deemed necessary, the whole PC was asked to contribute toward determining the outcome.

All PC members were given an opportunity to ask the PC chairs to discuss any paper they reviewed irrespective of the paper's tag (online-reject, online-accept, etc.)

Some additional clarifications/notes

Once a paper discussion was started, its outcome was determined before moving to the next paper (e.g., discussion was not put on hold, or the decision was not subjected to “accept-only-if-room” condition). This was done to ensure that the context was not lost due to a break in the discussion, and each paper was accepted/rejected on its absolute merit than its relative merit compared to other papers.

In case, a reviewer could not be present for the discussion of a paper, his/her view was represented by the PC chairs and other reviewers with similar review score. In multiple cases, the absent reviewers had further clarified their position via posting a comment in the Hotcrp system.

PC Chairs and General Chairs did not co-author any of the submissions under consideration. No submitted paper had both the PC Chairs as COI (conflict of interest). Therefore, no ad-hoc PC chair was employed to handle any paper.

Some additional clarifications/notes

PC-wide voting: In an event, whenever appropriate a PC-wide vote was casted to decide the outcome of a paper (e.g., when there was significant difference of opinion between the reviewers such that the PC chairs could not build a consensus among the reviewers, a reviewer made a strong case for PC-wide vote, etc.).

Whenever a PC-wide was casted, the all PC members were given a chance to ask clarifying questions to the reviewers before the vote (“first round” voting). In case of a tie at the end of first round voting, PC chairs asked the most positive and the most negative reviewer to make a short pitch (1-2 mins) for why the paper should be rejected or accepted. Then, the PC was asked to vote again (“second round” voting). A countdown-timer was employed to make the voting cut-off time known.

PC chairs did not cast their vote for any paper at any round to honor double-blind review practices. The PC chairs only moderated the discussion and did not argue in favor of or against any paper (i.e., remained neutral).