



Umeå University  
**Department of  
Computing Science**

# **Review results and then what?**

**Student Conference Course**

Thomas Hellström, Suna Bensch

<http://www8.cs.umu.se/kurser/5DV144/HT14/>



# The review process

- 13 papers were submitted (out of 16 possible)
- 12 were accepted
- 1 was rejected
- 2 reviewers per paper
  - Each reviewer suggested one of *Strong reject*, *Weak reject*, *Weak accept*, *Strong accept*
  - The editors made a combined decision *Accept/Reject*
  - A 3<sup>rd</sup> reviewer was used if conflicting reviews
  - Only 1 reviewer necessary if it is a *Strong reject*
- We had 9 different reviewers in total (mostly PhDs from the CS department)
- Normally, an *Accept* is conditioned with minor or major required changes of the paper



# If your paper got accepted with revisions

- Consider the comments from the reviewers
  - Revise according to all comments
  - Write a separate detailed revision document with:
    - Reviewer's comment, Your modification with reference to page and line numbers in the original file
- The revised paper must follow the formatting guidelines
- Submission by email
- Deadline January 5, 2015, at noon 12:00
- **Attach revision document and all files, including latex code, figures etc.**
- If the revised paper is accepted
  - You will present at the conference January 14, 2015, 09:00 a.m.
  - All authors are expected to be present during the entire conference
  - The paper will appear in the printed proceedings of the conference



# If your paper did not get accepted

- Consider the comments from the reviewers
  - Revise according to all comments
  - Write a separate detailed revision document with:
    - Reviewer's comment, Your modification with reference to page and line numbers in the original file
- The revised paper must follow the formatting guidelines
- Submission by email
- Deadline February 20, 2015, at noon 12:00
- **Attach revision document and all files, including latex code, figures etc.**
- If the revised paper is accepted
  - You will present for us (and other students) at the end of Feb.
  - You will get at most grade 3.
- The course is given each year



# The review system

- The main purpose is quality assurance
- In addition, peer reviews are one of the best ways to get really valuable feedback on your work
  - Reviewers work for free and often invest a lot of work
  - Reviewers are often acknowledged in the paper
- Many conferences have reviewers who are not really peers
  - You don't get really valuable feedback
  - Bad publications are accepted
- The Student Conference in Computing Science tries to be serious, critical, and constructive
- Good reviewers justify their comments
- The editors of the conference filter out unjustified reviews



# Dealing with the reviewers' comments

- See them as a way to improve your paper – not as personal insults
- You may think they are unfair or incorrect, but
  - other readers will probably make the same comments
  - the editors normally trust the reviewers
- Reviews may differ because reviewers may
  - focus on different aspects of the paper
  - have different opinions on what is acceptable
- That is, you should
  - assume that the review comments are correct, or at least have a core of truth
  - try to figure out WHY the reviewer wrote the way he/she did
  - resist the temptation to trying to show that you are right and they are wrong