



THE PUBLICATION PIPELINE

AKA

WHAT THE !@#% HAPPENS TO MY  
PAPER?

## PIPELINE OUTLINE

- X This is neither rocket science nor a clear-cut set of rules: details vary (significantly) between venues and communities.
- X We're going to look at:
  - Lifetime of a conference paper
  - Lifetime of a journal paper
  - Workshops, technical reports, preprints
  - Conferences vs. Journals
  - Single, Double, and N-th blind reviewing

# LIFETIME OF A CONFERENCE PAPER

1. Call for Papers (TPC)
2. Abstract Submission (Author)
3. Desk Rejection (TPC)
4. Conflict of Interest Declaration (TPC/Author)
5. Paper Bidding (TPC)
6. Paper Submission (Author)
7. Reviewing (TPC)
8. First Notification (TPC)
9. Rebuttal (Author)
10. Discussion (TPC)
11. Metareview (TPC)
12. F2F Discussion (TPC)
13. Final Notification (TPC)
14. Shepherding (TPC/Author)
15. Camera Ready Submission (Author)

NOT ALL STAGES APPLY TO ALL CONFERENCES

BUT UNDERLINED ACTIVITIES ARE THE MINIMUM THAT IS USUALLY INCLUDED.



## CALL FOR PAPERS

- X A public announcement that a specific event is accepting submissions, made by the Program Committee chairs
- X Information you should look after:
  - Deadlines
  - Formatting Guidelines (otherwise desk rejection)
  - Submission Guidelines (where to submit?)
  - Review Format (single or double blind)
  - Topics that are relevant
  - Program Committee Members

[Home](#) [ICSE 2020](#)

## Technical Papers

ICSE 2020

[About](#) [Program](#) [Call for Papers](#) [Accepted Papers](#) [Submitting to ICSE CAA](#)[Author Information](#)

### Call for Papers

ICSE is the premier forum for presenting and discussing the most recent and significant technical research contributions in the field of Software Engineering. We invite high quality submissions of technical research papers describing original and unpublished results of software engineering research. We welcome submissions addressing topics across the full spectrum of Software Engineering including but not limited to:

- Agile software development
- AI and software engineering
- Apps and app store analysis
- Autonomic and self-adaptive systems
- Cloud computing
- Component-based software engineering
- Configuration management and deployment
- Cloud sourced software engineering
- Cyber-physical systems
- Debugging
- Dependability, safety, and reliability
- Distributed and collaborative software engineering
- Embedded software
- Empirical software engineering
- End-user software engineering
- Fault localization
- Formal methods
- Green and sustainable technologies
- Human and social aspects of software engineering

- Program analysis
- Program comprehension
- Program repair
- Program synthesis
- Programming languages
- Recommendation systems
- Refactoring
- Requirements engineering
- Reverse engineering
- Search-based software engineering
- Security, privacy, and trust
- Software architecture
- Software economics and metrics
- Software evolution and maintenance
- Software modeling and design
- Software process
- Software product lines
- Software reuse
- Software services

#### Important Dates

KDD not applicable

Mon 5 - Wed 7 Oct 2020

Paper presentation sessions at KDD

Fri 7 Feb 2020

Camera ready

Mon 9 Dec 2019

Notification

Fri 8 Nov - Wed 12 Nov 2019

Author response period

Fri 20 Aug 2019

Full paper submission

#### Submission Link

<https://icse2020.caa.com>

#### Program Board

**Ryan Aydt**  
Stanford University  
Faculty

Program Board

**Antonio Bertolino**  
University of Pisa

Program Board

[Home](#) [»](#) [For Authors](#) [»](#) [Papers](#)

## Conference Program

[CHI 2020 Program](#)

## Recent Updates

- [CHI 2020 update](#)  
25th March 2020
- [CHI 2020 reimbursement policy](#)  
20th March 2020
- [CHI 2020 and COVID-19 \(Coronavirus\)](#)  
13th March 2020

## Past Deadlines

[» August 1st, 2019](#)[SIGCHI Student Travel Grant](#)[» September 15th, 2019](#)

**Papers:** Title, abstract, authors, subcommittee choice, and all other metadata

[» September 16th, 2019](#)

## Papers

### Quick Facts about Papers

CHI Papers are archival publications of original research in the field of Human Computer Interaction (HCI).

### Important Changes

- **Submission format:** Please use the appropriate [template](#), available for both LaTeX and Word (Windows and Mac). Note that for CHI 2020, we are returning to a slight variant of the template from CHI 2018 due to the many problems with the template used for CHI 2019.
- **Subcommittees:** Every year, the makeup of subcommittees changes as the field shifts and volumes of submissions change: some earlier committees have either had a reduction in scope, while others have expanded. Please carefully review the CFP and linked documents to ensure you select up to **two** appropriate subcommittees for your submission.
- **Presentation length:** at the conference, presentations of accepted papers will be 15 minutes in duration, including question time.

### Important Dates

- Abstract deadline (title, abstract, authors, subcommittee choices, and other metadata): **September 15th, 2019 at 12pm (noon) PT - Pacific Time**
- Submission deadline: **September 20th, 2019 at 12pm (noon) PT - Pacific Time**
- Reviews sent to authors: **November 15th, 2019 at 12pm (noon) PT - Pacific Time**

## Call for Papers

**Due to Coronavirus outbreak, submission deadline has been extended to March 21st for abstracts submissions and March 26th for papers submissions.**

The ACM MobiCom conference seeks papers describing significant research contributions in the field of wireless networking and mobile computing. MobiCom solicits papers that address important research challenges, including but not limited to communication networks, energy, computing, security and user experience. Successful papers should propose novel ideas to attack such problems through rigorous analysis, system design, and/or real-world measurement and deployment of mobile networks, systems and applications.

We want MobiCom'20 to be daring and emphasize novelty and creativity. The more novel the concept, the harder it can be to fully develop or evaluate all aspects, and the review process will take this into account. We encourage authors to discuss not only the significance but also the limitations of their ideas. We strongly encourage authors to describe how they will provide access to well-documented datasets, modeling and/or simulation tools, and codebases to support the reproducibility of their methods. MobiCom continues the two-deadline model and the reviewing process with one-shot revision plotted last year to improve the quality and timeliness of publications.

We invite submissions on a wide range of mobile computing and wireless networking research, including but not limited to:

- Applications of machine learning to mobile/wireless research
- Backscatter communication and wireless power
- Edge computing
- Embedded and energy-harvesting systems
- Experimental platforms and infrastructures for wireless/mobile research
- Implantable and wearable computing
- Interaction between mobile/wireless research, cloud computing, and software defined networking
- Long-range/low-power wide-area wireless networking
- Low-latency networking
- Machine-to-machine communications
- Millimeter wave and terahertz communications
- Mobile data science & analytics
- Mobile health
- Mobile web, video, virtual reality, and other applications
- Next generation 5G mobile networks
- Novel applications of wireless signals
- Robotic and drone-based networking
- Security and privacy reconfigurations for mobile/wireless systems
- Sensing with radio, light, sound, and acoustics



## ABSTRACT SUBMISSION

- X Some conferences require you to submit the title and abstract of your paper 1~2 weeks before the actual deadline
  - To help reviewers get some feeling of the overall submission trend, and prepare/do paper bidding on what each TPC member wants to review
  - To gauge the level of participation: may have to seek emergency reviewers
- X Abstract can change when you submit the full paper
- X You can decide not to submit the full paper after all



## DESK REJECTION

- X Obvious rejects are decided by chairs alone. Usually clear and undisputable violations of:
  - Formatting rules (30 page submission to 10+2 venue)
  - Reviewing rules (visible author names when reviewing is double blind)
  - Venue Scope (clearly irrelevant topics)
  - Parallel Submission or Obvious Plagiarism



## CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION

- X Authors and reviewers may have shared interest, i.e., it may benefit some reviewers if papers from some authors are accepted/rejected
  - Mutual reputation, rivalry/competition, etc
- X Both reviewers and authors should declare the people they have Col with:
  - Same or recent affiliation
  - Supervisor/student
  - Collaborators within the last N years (N tends to vary between fields/venues)
  - Any other personal relationship



## PAPER BIDDING

- X In some cases, TPC members “bid” for papers they want to review
  - Yes / No / Maybe or Lickert Scale
  - This is to reflect reviewer expertise in the process
- X Assignment of papers to review is based on the bidding
- X Tip: you *\*want\** to be reviewed by the right people, i.e., those who are true expert of the topic you’ve written about
  - Let your title and abstract clearly reflect this



## PAPER SUBMISSION

- X Well, follow the “how to write papers” advice and also be on time 😊
- X Seriously, be on time: sometimes there is a short “grace period” to silence complaints of system failures, etc, but they mean business
- X Pay attention to the deadline including the time zone
  - AoE (Anywhere on Earth) actually favours Korea, as we get almost a whole working day (midnight AoE = 9pm the next day in Korea)
  - **But not all deadlines are in AoE!**
  - Be careful about the **Daylight Saving Time!**



## REVIEWING + FIRST NOTIFICATION

- X Many different models:
  - Three reviewers from start to finish
  - Three reviewers plus One “metareviewer/discussion leader”
  - N reviewers for 1<sup>st</sup> round, reject obvious dislikes, then add M more reviewers to make the final decision
- X Varying loads (2~3 per reviewer for a small workshop to 20+ per reviewer for a large conference)
- X Tip: whatever the model is, the motivation for reviewers is to reject quickly (only half joking)
  - Do not suffer deaths by thousand cuts



## REBUTTAL

- X Only some venues adopt rebuttal
- X You get to “respond” to the reviews, but usually within a very short length limit (500 words): you have to prioritise.
- X In some venues, you even get to change the paper and resubmit.
- X You *\*will\** sometimes get idiot reviews
  - Do not get emotional
  - Do not immediately start writing your rebuttal
  - Take the high road, state the facts about the paper calmly, and *\*educate\** the reviewer as best as you can



## DISCUSSION + METAREVIEW

- X (Further) discussion happens online
- X One of the N reviewers, or sometimes an entirely separate TPC member, may be the “discussion leader”, prompting reviewers to participate
- X One of the N reviewers, or sometimes separately designated TPC member, may write up the “metareview”, summarizing the discussion and the conclusion



## FACE 2 FACE DISCUSSION

- X Some major venues hold a face to face meeting (perhaps at another big conference that happens at the right time)
  - Either the entire TPC, or
  - The “senior” layer of the TPC (e.g., Program Board)
- X At the F2F meeting, the TPC discusses each paper that has not yet been rejected one by one
  - With each paper, those who have CoIs should leave the room

# PROS AND CONS OF F2F PC MEETING

- X Pros (if you are on the PC)
  - You directly get embarrassed if you do a bad job
  - You get to network with some of the most respected peers
  
- X Cons
  - Loud voices may win
  - Environmentally not sustainable
  - Not everyone can afford to travel



A souvenir from ESEC/FSE 2018 PC Meeting (photo by Arie van Duersen)

<https://avandeursen.com/2018/06/25/my-last-pc-meeting/>



## FINAL NOTIFICATION + SHEPHERDING

- X Either congratulations, or commiserations!
- X Sometimes you get “shepherded” or a conditional accept
  - PC members want to make sure you do X to your paper before accepting.
  - The shepherd is the TPC member who enforces this by guiding you.
- X Remember, setbacks not failures
  - Read negative reviews after a few days



## CAMERA READY SUBMISSION

- X You finally submit the version that will go into the (digital or paper) proceedings – this is it, no further opportunity to fix or change anything
  - In fact, you should NOT change the paper too much – otherwise the venue would be accepting a paper that was NOT reviewed by the TPC
  - Now you reveal your identities if it was double blind
  - Papers get usually a bit longer (author details, acknowledgements, conference details, copyright information, etc) so be prepared for this from the beginning

# LIFETIME OF A JOURNAL PAPER

1. Call for Papers for Special Issues (Editors)
2. Paper Submission (Authors)
3. Desk Reject (Editors)
4. Reviewer Invitation (Editors)
5. Reviewing (Reviewers)
6. Notification (Editors)
7. Revision / Author Response (Authors)
8. Repeat 5-7
9. Camera Ready Submission (Author)



## CALL FOR PAPERS FOR SPECIAL ISSUES

- X Usually journals accept submissions all year around
- X Special Issues are an exception: if a journal wants to attract papers about a particular topic X, they will issue a CfP for the “Special Issue on X” and set a deadline
- X Another type of SI is based on conferences: some conferences agree with journals to make a special issue on conference X year Y
  - The best papers from that conference are invited to submit a journal version



## JOURNAL EXTENSION

- X This is the process of extending a conference paper into a journal paper (either by invitation to SI or by authors themselves)
- X Rule of thumb is that at least 30% of the journal version should be “intellectually new”
  - Simply adding more subjects to the experiment won't cut it
  - It is strongly recommended that you rewrite shared stuff
    - Title, abstract, and introduction **MUST BE NEW!**
  - The journal paper should explicitly state that this is an extended version of the conference paper (cite); preferably, also list the points of extension



## COVER LETTER

- X If you are submitting a journal extension, it is customary to include a cover letter that explains
  - Where the original paper was submitted
  - What the original paper was about
  - Why you think this journal is a good fit
  - How the extended paper is different from the conference version
  - Section-by-section comparison between two versions

## HOW THE EMSE VERSION IS EXTENDED FROM THE SSBSE VERSION

SHIN YOO, MARK HARMAN AND SHMUEL UR

This paper is an extended version of a conference paper submitted to the "Highly Scalable Multi-Objective Test Suite Minimisation Using Genetic Algorithms" workshop. We have edited and extended almost every section of prose and added significant contributions to extend the paper for ESMSE.

Our new technical contributions are aimed at increasing the amount of evidence for our claims about a scalability and performance improvements to test suite minimisation using GPGPU (compared to single core, multi code and multi thread).

We feel that for EMSE with its focus on empirical evidence, the main extension is to provide more scientific evidence on which to base the claims in the conference paper, which is why we adopted this overall approach.

The extra space afforded by the journal version format also allows us to provide details of the results and our statistical analysis of them. We hope this will support replication studies, which we think is also suitable for an IEEE paper.

Specifically, the primary technical additions are as follows:

- (1) We have performed empirical evaluation of two more Multi-Objective Algorithms: The Two-Archive algorithm and SPEA2. The original paper discussed the effects of various forms of multicore computation platform (NSGA2). The extension provides results for the performance improvements that accrue from our GPGPU formulation on these two other well-known algorithms, both of which are widely used in multi objective optimisation.
- (2) The paper has been re-written to accommodate the inclusion of these algorithms.
- (3) Detailed statistical analysis of the results for all 3 algorithms is provided in an appendix. Space did not permit this detail form the conference version, but we think it is important for subsequent replication studies.
- (4) We have added a detailed "threats to validity" section. Once again, space did not allow us to do this in the conference version, but we think, for the sake of replication, this is important.

Textual changes and additions have been made to the prose in most sections (with some new sections added). These are summarised below:

- Abstract: re-written.

1

2

SHIN YOO, MARK HARMAN AND SHMUEL UR

- Section 1: re-written, including extra paragraphs, revised motivation and summary of additional technical contributions
- Section 2: we added a little bit more background information on test suite minimization
- Section 3: we added a description of the matrix notations (this was not included in the conference version due to space limitations)
- Section 5.3, 5.4: These two were partly re-written to accommodate new algorithms
- Section 6: This section was partly re-written to accommodate new algorithms. The section also contains new tables and plots for the new results
- Section 7: completely new
- Appendix: completely new



## REVIEWERS

- X Journals do not maintain a fixed pool of reviewers (as in TPC)
- X Editors can invite anyone they think are appropriate (Cols considered)
- X Tip: as your research career progresses, you will and should get review invitations – try to accept them unless you have good reasons
  - This is the “community service” that you do for science
  - If you are any good as a reviewer, eventually you get to read the \*latest\* research from some of the best peers
  - Do not outsource, unless there is a good reason; give credit



## REVISION

- X Possible outcomes after reviewing:
- Accept as it is (rarely happens at the first attempt)
  - Major Revision (the most frequent outcome)
  - Minor Revision (usually after at least one major revision)
  - Revise and Resubmit (some journals call major revision this..?)
  - Reject (it is really bad)



## MAJOR REVISION

- X This is the most likely outcome, even if your work is good
- X Reviewers agree that there is \*something\* here, but they have serious questions that may affect the soundness of the work – they want you to clarify things for them
  - Can lead to more or re- experimentation: do not despair as this happens to the best of us
  - Sometimes you just have to rewrite, but carefully



## MINOR REVISION

- X The paper is almost ready to be published, but reviewers still have relatively minor issues
- X Usually can be fixed by rewriting and providing clarifications



## AUTHOR RESPONSE

- X You get to respond to reviewers with each revision
- X Choose a specific format, and stick to it
  - Foreword (thank the reviewers...)
  - A summary of changes in the revised version
  - A point-to-point response to each reviewer, each with clear information on what actually changed in the paper
- X I recommend answering to *\*every\** point raised in the review: if you pick and choose, it becomes harder for reviewers to compare changes



## AUTHOR RESPONSE

- X Impression matters – and the impression you want to make is that you have considered all points carefully and \*actually\* worked them into the paper
- X Do NOT pick a fight with reviewers, however silly you think they are
  - In some cases, nitpicking is more aggravating than major difference in world-views: if you can accommodate their points without changing your results or claim, play along...
  - If someone is being truly unjust and bad for science, you can rightly ignore the comment (but this will be a rare thing)

# Response to Reviewers' Comments on TOSEM-2015-0161: Analysis of Human Competitiveness of Genetic Programming in Spectrum Based Fault Localisation

Shin Yoo, Xiaoyuan Xie, Fei-Ching Kuo, Tsong-Yueh Chen, and Mark Harman

September 6, 2016

## 1 Introduction

We would like to thank the reviewers for their speedy and authoritative reviews. We have responded to each and every comment of each of the reviewers and each of their comments has caused us to change the paper as a result. In this response document we list the reviewers' comments (one section per reviewer) and give our response, explaining how we have changed the paper as a result of the reviewers' comments and requests.

We believe that the paper is significantly improved as a result and we would like to thank the reviewers, once again, for providing detailed, constructive and helpful comments and revision requests.

## 2 Summary of Major Revision

The paper has been revised with the following major modifications, all of which have been typeset in blue for readability:

- 1. Clearer Context:** We have modified the text so that our contribution can be identified in a clearer context (for example, single fault scenarios) and clarified the motivation behind the empirical evaluation. The paper now also contains discussions about some relevant papers pointed out by reviewers, linking our contribution to the existing literature more clearly.
- 2. Readability improvement:** We added high-level guidance and summaries to the formal proof for improved readability.
- 3. Improved Statistics:** We added more detailed statistics (results of normality test, effect size measured in  $A_{12}$ ) and clarified our choice of statistical treatments in the prose that describes the empirical parts of the paper.

## 3 Detailed Response to Reviewer Comments

### 3.1 Reviewer 1

#### Reviewer's Comment

The authors need to be clear about the fact that this results are to be read in the context of single faults (perhaps even in the title).

#### Response

Thanks. It is indeed an important contextual information.

#### Changes Made To The Paper As A Result

We have changed the abstract as well as Sections containing the introduction and the conclusion to reflect the fact that the results stand with respect to single fault scenarios only.

#### Reviewer's Comment

Section 1: There are other papers that are more relevant to "for helping humans find faults faster" than the one the authors cited. Actually, the cited paper sort of points out issues why SBFL is not helping developers yet and guided to the development of work such as Gouveia, et al. "Using HTML5 visualizations in software fault localization.", First IEEE Working Conference on Software Visualization (VISSOFT), 2013.

#### Response

Thank you for informing us of an interesting reference.

#### Changes Made To The Paper As A Result

The suggested publication has been cited and discussed in the revised paper. We also added other relevant recent work on fault localisation to keep the paper up-to-date.

#### Reviewer's Comment

Section 1: It seems to me that there is a strong focus on single faults, but the introduction does not make that point clear. Either the authors extend the analysis to explicitly consider multiple faults or make this explicit in the introduction.

## CONFERENCE VS. JOURNAL

- X Quick turnaround (3–4 months)
- X Tracks speed of things
- X Direct dissemination through talks
- X More valuable (at least in CS)
- X More random (unfortunate paper assignment within a fixed TPC = kill)
- X Can take long (up to 2 years not rare)
- X Archival purposes
- X People have to want to read
- X Needed for career (at least in Korea)
- X More depth in process (expert reviewers ideally, dialogue via responses)

CONCLUSION: DO BOTH  
(WHAT DID YOU EXPECT?)

## CONFERENCE VS. JOURNAL

- X CS is atypical in that conference papers convey a lot of prestige ([link](#))
- X Compared to the international standard, journals have been preferred in Korea as a measure of one's academic prowess
  - Some fought very hard to change this climate
- X Ironically, in some fields (e.g., SE), some people are now vocal supporters of journal-based publication, because:
  - Conferences are too random, not sustainable, too costly, limited in length due to presentation, etc

## JOURNAL FIRST

- X As a compromise between conference and journal models, conferences in some fields are adopting what is called a Journal First track
  - Conference makes an agreement with journals
  - There is usually a separate JF TPC
  - JF TPC invites papers that have been directly published into journals to the conference, to make a presentation
- X Benefits of journal model (better communication, no space restriction, etc) + benefits of conferences (you get to directly communicate via talks)

## TYPES OF VENUES AND PUBLICATIONS

- X Workshop: to discuss and evaluate ongoing works – usually what you have published as a workshop paper can be a basis of a future conference paper (this is not called an extension)
  - Attending a good workshop for your topic can help a LOT
- X Technical Report: institutional archiving without any peer reviewing – sometimes used to “timestamp” your idea (i.e., I had result X on date Y)
- X Preprint: basically manuscripts without peer reviews, but publicly available – the purpose is to circulate your latest results to the community (e.g., arxiv.org)

## BLIND REVIEWING

- X Blind reviewing means that, to varying degrees, author/reviewer identities are hidden during the process
- X To provide fair opportunities to less known authors and institutions
- X To prevent common biases affecting reviewing outcomes
- X To allow academic discussion free from status and other influences
- X NOT to penalize top-performing authors and institutions
- X NOT to allow reviewers anonymity to do anything they want

# SINGLE/DOUBLE/N-TH BLIND REVIEWING

- X Single Blind Reviewing: reviewers know authors, but authors do not know reviewers
  - Some people believe that, in order for peer reviewing to work properly, we should do open reviews ([link](#))
- X Double Blind: reviewers do not know authors, authors do not know reviewers
  - Sometimes it is “soft”: the blind is lifted in the discussion period to check against previous work
- X Triple Blind: reviewers do not get to know the identities of each other
  - Sometimes done until some point in the reviewing process – to prevent seniority affecting the decision

## COMMON OBJECTIONS

- X “DBR makes it harder to properly judge the current submission with respect to previous work”
- X “I can correctly guess who the authors are in the most cases – why bother?”
- X “It is simply more work for PC chairs as they have to check for violations”
- X “I am not biased by any of these, really”

## WHY DBR?

- X I personally am an advocate for Double Blind Reviewing (DBR)
- X There are multiple scientific results that says affiliation, name, country, and gender do affect the outcome ([link](#))
- X DBR does not mean that identities should be hidden at all cost – this is not possible if someone really wants to find out
- X The aim is to \*help\* reviewers not to know the identities too easily

# SUMMARIES

- X Understand the key stages in publication pipeline
- X Understand the different types of publications (conference, journal, workshop, technical report, preprint...)
- X Know how to respond to reviewers
- X Understand what Double Blind Reviewing process aims to achieve