


Key:



Two phase review process

Two phase reviewing is a sensible way to deal with increasing submission numbers.

	4%	11%	8%	34%	42%	73	4.0	0.5	47%
PC	0%	4%	4%	38%	54%	26	4.4	0.7	54%
ERC	6%	15%	11%	32%	36%	47	3.8	0.4	43%

It is important that authors are given the opportunity to respond before phase one decisions are made.

	5%	11%	14%	23%	47%	73	3.9	0.5	52%
PC	4%	0%	27%	23%	46%	26	4.1	0.5	50%
ERC	6%	17%	6%	23%	47%	47	3.9	0.4	53%

Early notification of phase one decisions helps authors.

	5%	8%	10%	21%	56%	73	4.1	0.6	62%
PC	4%	4%	8%	19%	65%	26	4.4	0.7	69%
ERC	6%	11%	11%	21%	51%	47	4.0	0.5	57%

Splitting my reviewing load across two deadlines is preferable to having all my reviews due at once

No average: only PC members were asked this question

PC	12%	4%	4%	31%	50%	26	4.0	0.5	62%
----	-----	----	----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

Review process and quality

It was good that authorship remained anonymous for as much as the reviewing process as possible

	5%	5%	21%	26%	42%	73	3.9	0.5	48%
PC	0%	4%	27%	23%	46%	26	4.1	0.6	46%
ERC	9%	6%	17%	28%	40%	47	3.9	0.4	49%

I would prefer a blind-until-accept polic

	32%	15%	15%	19%	19%	73	2.8	-0.1	51%
PC	46%	12%	8%	12%	23%	26	2.5	-0.2	69%
ERC	23%	17%	19%	23%	17%	47	2.9	0.0	40%

On the whole the (other) reviews I read were constructive and professional.

	3%	10%	13%	39%	36%	72	4.0	0.5	39%
PC	0%	0%	8%	38%	54%	26	4.5	0.7	54%
ERC	4%	15%	15%	39%	26%	46	3.7	0.3	30%

It is sufficient for some submissions to only have three reviews.

	4%	4%	12%	23%	56%	73	4.2	0.6	60%
PC	0%	4%	15%	15%	65%	26	4.4	0.7	65%
ERC	6%	4%	11%	28%	51%	47	4.1	0.6	57%

Expertise grades should be made visible to author

	4%	11%	23%	25%	37%	73	3.8	0.4		41%
PC	8%	15%	19%	27%	31%	26	3.6	0.3	1.3	38%
ERC	2%	9%	26%	23%	40%	47	3.9	0.5	1.1	43%

Separating conviction and acceptances as orthogonal categories is not a good idea

	18%	15%	21%	21%	25%	72	3.2	0.1		43%
PC	19%	19%	23%	19%	19%	26	3.0	0.0	1.4	38%
ERC	17%	13%	20%	22%	28%	46	3.3	0.2	1.5	46%

A binary accept/reject grade feels too harsh.

	19%	21%	18%	22%	21%	73	3.0	0.0		40%
PC	23%	19%	23%	19%	15%	26	2.8	-0.1	1.4	38%
ERC	17%	21%	15%	23%	23%	47	3.1	0.1	1.4	40%

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

	26%	29%	15%	22%	8%	73	2.6	-0.2		34%
PC	35%	27%	8%	19%	12%	26	2.5	-0.3	1.4	46%
ERC	21%	30%	19%	23%	6%	47	2.6	-0.2	1.2	28%

Paper submission and formatting requirements

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

	1%	6%	10%	17%	67%	72	4.4	0.7		68%
PC	0%	4%	8%	19%	69%	26	4.5	0.8	0.8	69%
ERC	2%	7%	11%	15%	65%	46	4.3	0.7	1.1	67%

The page limit for PLDI'15 was about right.

	0%	6%	15%	46%	33%	72	4.1	0.5		33%
PC	0%	12%	12%	38%	38%	26	4.0	0.5	1.0	38%
ERC	0%	2%	17%	50%	30%	46	4.1	0.5	0.8	30%

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

	6%	0%	15%	35%	44%	72	4.1	0.6		50%
PC	4%	0%	12%	38%	46%	26	4.2	0.6	1.0	50%
ERC	7%	0%	17%	33%	43%	46	4.1	0.5	1.1	50%

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

	21%	13%	30%	30%	7%	71	2.9	-0.1		28%
PC	23%	12%	23%	35%	8%	26	2.9	0.0	1.3	31%
ERC	20%	13%	33%	27%	7%	45	2.9	-0.1	1.2	27%

PC Discussion and Proce

Overall I was satisfied with my paper assignments

	0%	8%	5%	52%	34%	73	4.1	0.6		34%
PC	0%	4%	4%	73%	19%	26	4.1	0.5	0.6	19%
ERC	0%	11%	6%	40%	43%	47	4.1	0.6	1.0	43%

Authors should be invited to suggest potential expert reviewers

	25%	18%	26%	19%	12%	73	2.8	-0.1		37%
PC	23%	19%	23%	23%	12%	26	2.8	-0.1	1.4	35%
ERC	26%	17%	28%	17%	13%	47	2.7	-0.1	1.4	38%

Online discussions were effective in facilitating fair and considered outcomes

	1%	7%	14%	47%	32%	73	4.0	0.5		33%
PC	0%	0%	8%	54%	38%	26	4.3	0.7	0.6	38%
ERC	2%	11%	17%	43%	28%	47	3.8	0.4	1.0	30%

I agree that the PC Chair should place a high priority on ensuring authors are given the right to respond to all review

	4%	10%	14%	25%	48%	73	4.0	0.5		52%
PC	4%	4%	8%	27%	58%	26	4.3	0.7	1.0	62%

ERC 4% 13% 17% 23% 43% 47 3.9 **0.4** 1.2 47%

The two-day PC meeting was organised in a way that ensured fair and efficient outcomes

No average: only PC members were asked this question

PC 0% 4% 8% 23% 65% 26 4.5 **0.8** 0.8 65%

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

No average: only PC members were asked this question

PC 4% 4% 15% 46% 31% 26 4.0 **0.5** 1.0 35%

PC Meeting Venue and Logistics

Locating the meeting outside New York city was a good choice

No average: only PC members were asked this question

PC 12% 4% 38% 15% 31% 26 3.5 **0.3** 1.3 42%

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

No average: only PC members were asked this question

PC 4% 0% 12% 28% 56% 25 4.3 **0.7** 1.0 60%

Overall Feedback

I think as a whole the reviewing process was fair

4% 5% 4% 33% 53% 73 4.3 **0.6** 58%

PC 0% 0% 4% 35% 62% 26 4.6 **0.8** 0.6 62%

ERC 6% 9% 4% 32% 49% 47 4.1 **0.5** 1.2 55%

On the whole the main PC operated well as a group

No average: only PC members were asked this question

PC 0% 0% 0% 23% 77% 26 4.8 **0.9** 0.4 77%

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

No average: only ERC members were asked this question

ERC 2% 2% 17% 26% 52% 46 4.2 **0.6** 1.0 54%

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

No average: only ERC members were asked this question

ERC 2% 6% 6% 32% 53% 47 4.3 **0.6** 1.0 55%