**Key:**

- Two phase reviewing is a sensible way to deal with increasing submission numbers.
- It is important that authors are given the opportunity to respond before phase one decisions are made.
- Early notification of phase one decisions helps authors.
- Splitting my reviewing load across two deadlines is preferable to having all my reviews due at once.
- Review process and quality:
  - It was good that authorship remained anonymous for as much as the reviewing process as possible.
  - I would prefer a blind-until-accept policy.
  - On the whole the (other) reviews I read were constructive and professional.
  - It is sufficient for some submissions to only have three reviews.
  - Expertise grades should be made visible to author.
Separating conviction and acceptances as orthogonal categories is not a good idea

A binary accept/reject grade feels too harsh.

I would have preferred to have had more dimensions on which I could quantitatively score each paper

### Paper submission and formatting requirements

Excluding the bibliography from the page limit is a good idea.

The page limit for PLDI'15 was about right.

As a reviewer, I felt that the use of 10pt font size for submissions is a good move.

When reviewing papers, I found the use of author-year citation style as an improvement.

### PC Discussion and Proce

Overall I was satisfied with my paper assignments

Authors should be invited to suggest potential expert reviewers

Online discussions were effective in facilitating fair and considered outcomes

I agree that the PC Chair should place a high priority on ensuring authors are given the right to respond to all revie
The two-day PC meeting was organised in a way that ensured fair and efficient outcomes

Holding the meeting on a Friday and Saturday was a good choice

**PC Meeting Venue and Logistics**

Locating the meeting outside New York city was a good choice

As a venue IBM Learning Center was well suited to hosting a PC meeting

**Overall Feedback**

I think as a whole the reviewing process was fair

On the whole the main PC operated well as a group

My perspective as a reviewer was that on the whole the ERC fulfilled its role well

Overall I felt that my reviewing load was reasonable for an ERC member