🧩 Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP reviewers

* 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 reviewers

* 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 served as a reviewer 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 served as a reviewer at a CL/NLP venue in 2019-2021
   - End the survey: I have not recently served as a reviewer at CL/NLP venues

Back

Next

Page 2 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP reviewers

* 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 own 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? *

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

8. At what venues have you performed peer review for 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 reviewers

* Required

Your most recent experience as a reviewer in CL/NLP

9. When did you last serve as a reviewer for an CL/NLP venue? *

- 2021
- 2020
- 2019
- earlier than 2019

10. For what venue did you last serve as a reviewer? *

- *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. When you last served as a reviewer, approximately how many submissions where you assigned to review? *

Select your answer

12. When you last served as a reviewer, were you also an author of at least one submission to the same venue? *

- yes
- 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 reviewers

* Required

How did it go?

14. Consider the last time you served as reviewer at an CL/NLP venue. How satisfied were you with the paper-reviewer matching? *

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

15. Given your experience with CL/NLP venues in the recent years, was your most recent paper assignment(s), you described above, better or worse than on average? *

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

Back | Next | Page 5 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP reviewers

* Required

What were the issues, if any?

16. Consider your last assignment(s) at an CL/NLP venue. If there were any issues with the paper-reviewer matching (irrespective of the quality of the papers), what were the issues? If there were none, please indicate that. *

- [ ] The paper was not in my area of expertise, and that should have been clear from my publication record
- [ ] The paper was not in my area of expertise - although that would not be clear from my publication record
- [ ] The area match was right, but the subject of the paper was not interesting to me (e.g. I would prefer another NLP task, model, or data)
- [ ] The area match was right, but the paper was not asking a research question that would be interesting for me
- [ ] Other issue
- [ ] There were no issues with paper-reviewer matching

17. Consider your last assignment(s) as peer reviewer. If you have had other issues with poor paper-reviewer matches that were not mentioned above, what were they? Please focus on the paper-reviewer match rather than any quality issues with the papers themselves.

    Please refrain from providing details that could identify specific papers.

    Enter your answer

18. If this was not your first time as a peer reviewer, and you have received problematic assignments in the recent years: what issues have you experienced? Check all that apply. Please focus on the match rather than any quality issues with the papers themselves. If you have not had any issues, or this question is not applicable to you, please indicate that.
    *

    - [ ] The paper was not in my area of expertise, and that should have been clear from my publication record
    - [ ] The paper was not in my area of expertise - although that would not be clear from my publication record
    - [ ] The area match was right, but the subject of the paper was not interesting to me (e.g. I would prefer another NLP task, model, or data)
    - [ ] The area match was right, but the paper was not asking a research question that would be interesting for me
    - [ ] Other issue
    - [ ] I have never had issues with paper-reviewer matching
    - [ ] N/A (this was my first time as a reviewer)

19. If you have experienced issues with poor paper-reviewer matches (prior to your last assignment(s) discussed above) what were they? Please focus on the paper-reviewer match rather than any quality issues with the papers themselves.

    Please refrain from providing details that could identify specific papers.

    Enter your answer

20. If at any point in your experience as a CL/NLP reviewer you have been assigned to review papers out of your area of expertise, what kinds of expertise mismatch have you experienced? If you have not had any such issues, please indicate that.
*

- [ ] I was not familiar with the methods used in the study
- [ ] I was not familiar with the subfield (e.g. question answering, argument mining)
- [ ] I was not familiar with the language(s) studied
- [ ] I was not familiar with the datasets used in the study
- [ ] Other
- [ ] I have never had issues with area mismatch

Back | Next | Page 6 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP reviewers

* 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.

21. Consider your last peer review assignment at an CL/NLP venue. What do you think was the method used for assigning papers to you? If you do not know, make a guess.
*

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

Back | Next | Page 7 of 8

Survey on paper-reviewer assignments for NLP reviewers

* Required

How should the paper-reviewer matching be done?

22. 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 a reviewer consider the best for assigning submissions to you in future conferences? *

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

23. 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

24. If you are given one month to review a batch of papers, what do you think would be **your** optimal number of papers to review within this time, so as to ensure high quality reviews? *

Select your answer

25. As a reviewer, how important do you think the following factors are for a paper-reviewer match, so as to ensure a high quality review? *

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important	Not sure
I have worked on the same type of task(s) as the paper (e.g. hate speech detection, machine translation, co-reference resolution, etc.).						
I have worked with the same methods (e.g. a class of ML models, a type of linguistic analysis, crowdsourcing etc).						
I have worked with the same (or similar) data.						
I have 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						
I am interested in reviewing the paper (when bidding is possible)						
I was personally invited by the Area Chair / Action Editor because of my expertise						

You can print a copy of your answer after you submit

Back Submit Page 8 of 8