🧩 Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

1. This survey is a part of a research project at the University of Copenhagen on paper-reviewer matching in Computational Linguistics (CL) and Natural Language Processing (NLP).

   The goal of this survey is to identify the current practices of making paper-reviewer assignments in CL/NLP conferences and ways in which this process can be improved. Your response is fully anonymous and will be used for research purposes only. Responses may be shared in anonymous form with other researchers for related studies.

   Do you consent to these terms? *

   - ○ I consent, begin the survey
   - ○ I do not consent, end the survey

Next

Page 1 of 8

🧩 Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

2. For the purposes of this survey, we are interested in hearing from the reviewers at various career stages, but the survey assumes that you have received peer review for at least one submission in the field of CL/NLP in the last three years (2019-2021).

   Does this apply to your situation? *

   - ○ Yes, I have received peer review at a CL/NLP venue in 2019-2021
   - ○ End the survey: I have not recently received peer review at CL/NLP venues

Back | Next

Page 2 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

Your background

3. What is the best description of your current career status? *

- Undergraduate/Bachelor's student
- Graduate/Master's student
- Graduate/PhD student
- Postdoc
- Academic researcher
- Industry researcher
- Independent researcher
- Other

4. What kinds of contributions do you make in your work? Check all types of work that you have performed.

   If you are not sure, an explanation of different paper types is available here: http://coling2018.org/paper-types/
   *

- [ ] Computationally-aided linguistic analysis
- [ ] NLP engineering experiment paper
- [ ] Reproduction paper
- [ ] Resource paper
- [ ] Position paper
- [ ] Survey paper
- [ ] Other

5. How many times have you had your own paper peer-reviewed for a CL/NLP venue? *

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- more than 10 times

6. How many times have you served as a reviewer for CL/NLP venues? *

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- more than 10 times

7. How many times have you served as an Area Chair/Action Editor for CL/NLP venues? *

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- more than 10 times

8. At what venues have you received peer review for your CL/NLP submissions? Check all that apply. *

- [ ] *ACL conference (ACL, EMNLP, NAACL, EACL, AACL)
- [ ] A satellite *ACL event: WMT, CoNLL, *SEM, SemEval, workshops
- [ ] ACL rolling review
- [ ] a CL/NLP journal (e.g. TACL, CL)
- [ ] a different CL/NLP conference (e.g. COLING, LREC)
- [ ] a machine learning conference (e.g. NeurIPS, ICLR, ICML)
- [ ] other

Back | Next | Page 3 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

Your most recent experience as an author in CL/NLP

9. When did you last have a paper peer reviewed for a CL/NLP venue? *

- 2021
- 2020
- 2019
- earlier than 2019

10. At what venue did you last receive peer review for a CL/NLP submission(s)? *

- *ACL conference (ACL, EMNLP, NAACL, EACL, AACL)
- a satellite *ACL event: WMT, CoNLL, *SEM, SemEval, workshops
- ACL rolling review
- a CL/NLP journal (e.g. TACL, CL)
- a different CL/NLP conference (e.g. COLING, LREC)
- a machine learning conference (e.g. NeurIPS, ICLR, ICML)
- other

11. For how many submissions for that venue were you an author? *

Select your answer

12. Did you also serve as a reviewer for the same venue? *

- Yes, I also served as a reviewer
- No, but I helped the venue in some other role
- No

13. Do you know what process this venue used to assign papers to reviewers? *

- Yes (I was told explicitly or looked it up)
- Probably (I don't know for sure but can guess)
- No

Back | Next | Page 4 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

How did it go?

14. Consider your last submission(s) to an NLP conference/journal that you received reviews for. How satisfied were you with respect to the amount of constructive criticism in the reviews you received?

    This includes questions and comments that helped you to improve your paper. For example, the reviewers could point out methodological issues, errors in implementation or proofs, gaps in literature review, issues with framing and figures, language errors, etc. *

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

15. Given your experience with NLP conferences in the recent years, would you say your most recent set of reviews, described above, was better or worse than on average? *

- It was better
- It was average
- It was worse
- Not sure
- N/A (this was my first submission)

Back | Next | Page 5 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

What were the issues, if any?

16. Consider your last submission(s) to an NLP venue that you received reviews for. If any reviews were unhelpful, what were the issues? Check all that apply. If you did not have any issues, please indicate that. *

- [ ] The reviewer did not have the required expertise to review this paper
- [ ] The reviewer was not interested in the subject of the paper
- [ ] The reviewer was biased against certain types of research (e.g. systems not aiming at SOTA results, research not on English, resource papers etc.)
- [ ] The review was harsh or rude
- [ ] The review was not sufficiently clear, e.g. requesting other methods or references without specifying them
- [ ] The criticism was too broad (e.g. "not surprising", "too simple")
- [ ] The review was too short
- [ ] The reviewer requested more experiments/evidence than necessary to prove the point of the paper
- [ ] Other
- [ ] I did not have any issues with my reviews

17. Consider your last submission(s) to an NLP venue that you received reviews for. If you have had other issues with low-quality reviews, what were they?

    Please refrain from providing details that could identify specific papers.

    Enter your answer

18. If this was not your first NLP submission, and you have received problematic reviews in the recent years: what issues have you experienced? Check all that apply. If this was your first submission, or you have not received problematic reviews in recent years, please indicate that. *

- [ ] The reviewer did not have the required expertise to review this paper
- [ ] The reviewer was not interested in the subject of the paper
- [ ] The reviewer was biased against certain types of research (e.g. systems not aiming at SOTA results, research not on English, resource papers etc.)
- [ ] The review was harsh or rude
- [ ] The review was not sufficiently clear, e.g. requesting other methods or references without specifying them
- [ ] The criticism was too broad (e.g. "not surprising", "too simple")
- [ ] The review was too short
- [ ] The reviewer requested more experiments/evidence than necessary to prove the point of the paper
- [ ] Other
- [ ] I have never received problematic reviews
- [ ] Not applicable (this was my first submission)

19. If you have had other issues with low-quality reviews, what were they?

    Please refrain from providing details that could identify specific papers.

    Enter your answer

Back | Next | Page 6 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

How was the paper-reviewer matching done?

Different venues use different methods to assign papers to reviewers. Some of the common methods include:

- *bidding phase*: the reviewers are shown a list of submissions and are asked to enter their preferences, which are then taken into account in the assignment
- *automated matching* based on similarity scores: a system computes some representation for the submission and the reviewer profile, based on their previous publications, and outputs similarity scores for submissions and candidate reviewers
- *manual checks* by the chairs: the area chairs manually check the potential reviewer profiles and try to find the optimal matches

20. Consider your last submission to an NLP conference/journal that you received reviews for. What do you think was the method used for assigning reviewers to your submission? If you do not know, make a guess. *

- ○ Reviewers were assigned manually by area chairs / action editors
- ○ Reviewers were assigned based on the bidding information
- ○ Reviewers were assigned automatically (based on similarity scores)
- ○ Reviewers were assigned randomly (given conflicts of interest and review quotas)
- ○ Reviewers were assigned based on both automated similarity scores and manual checks
- ○ Reviewers were assigned based on both bidding information and manual checks
- ○ Other method

Back | Next | Page 7 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP authors

* Required

How should the paper-reviewer matching be done?

21. Most CL/NLP conferences receive high volumes of submissions, which makes it impractical to perform paper-reviewer matching manually. Given that, which of the following options would you as an author consider the best for assigning reviewers to your conference submissions? *

- Reviewers should be assigned manually by area chairs / action editors
- Reviewers should be assigned based on the bidding information
- Reviewers should be assigned automatically (based on similarity scores)
- Reviewers should be assigned randomly (given conflicts of interest and review quotas)
- Reviewers should be assigned based on both automated similarity scores and manual checks
- Reviewers should be assigned based on both bidding information and manual checks
- Other method

22. Is there a better alternative for paper-reviewer matching that was not listed in the above options? If so, please describe it.

Enter your answer

23. For a researcher working in your area(s), how important do you think the following factors are to ensure good paper-reviewer matching for your papers? *

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important	Not sure
The reviewer has worked on the same type of task(s) as the paper (e.g. hate speech detection, machine translation, co-reference resolution, etc.).						
The reviewer has worked with the same methods (e.g. a class of ML models, a type of linguistic analysis, crowdsourcing etc).						
The reviewer has worked with the same (or similar) data.						
The reviewer has published the same types of papers (e.g. linguistic analysis paper, engineering experiment paper, reproduction paper, resource paper, position paper, survey paper).						
The automated similarity score is high						
The reviewer has shown interest in reviewing the paper (through bidding)						
The Area Chair / Action Editor knows the reviewer professionally and trust them to make good reviews						

You can print a copy of your answer after you submit

Back Submit Page 8 of 8