

Conference Reviewing

Kathryn S. McKinley
University of Texas at Austin

Kathryn McKinley

The University of Texas at Austin

- ◉ An experimental computer scientist in the area of programming language implementation (SIGPLAN, SIGARCH)
- ◉ 40+ program committees
- ◉ Program Chair
 - > PLDI 2007, PACT 2005, ASPLOS 2004
- ◉ TOPLAS Editor-in-chief

Improving the conference reviewing process

- ◉ Why? It determines progress and direction of computer science research
- ◉ SIGPLAN NOTICES 2008
Editorial: <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/mckinley/notes/blind.html>

Double blind reviewing

◉ What is it?

- > Submission does not include authors' names or institutions
- > Review as is
- > Policy choice: reveal after scoring or at PC meeting to properly evaluate related work and uncover unrevealed conflicts

◉ Objections

- > More work for authors and committees
- > Doesn't work because you can always tell
- > Makes it harder to build on your own prior work

◉ Advantages

- > Scientists are human, and humans have biases
- > Reminder to evaluate submissions only on its own merits
- > Reduces gender, institution and individual biases

In person committee meetings

- Objections

- > Email is cheap
- > Lots of time for PC discussion
- > Less likely PC member will 'skip'

- Advantages

- > Forces people to focus
- > PC chair can discuss every paper
- > High bandwidth discussions
- > Tone?

Review panel

- ◉ What is it?
 - > Replaces ad hoc external reviewers
 - > Pre-selected panel of experts to supplement PC expertise
 - > Does not attend PC meeting, reviews less papers
- ◉ Disadvantages
 - > May reduce expertise
 - > PC chair must still find some ad hoc reviewers
 - > Concentrates reviewing load
- ◉ Advantages
 - > More uniform reviewing due to larger pool
 - > Formally recognized, so people will say yes
 - > Less work for PC chair, since software helps with double-blind conflict detection, handles bids on papers, etc.

Author response

- ◉ What is it?
 - > Author writes a response to reviews before the committee makes their final decisions
- ◉ Objections
 - > More work for everyone
- ◉ Advantages
 - > Reviews come in earlier
 - > Encourages more responsible reviewing
 - > Catches mistakes, e.g., less likely to reject based on one missing citation
 - > Less PC chair stress!