



Adriano Veloso &lt;adrianov@gmail.com&gt;

---

## [SIGIR 2015] SIGIR Reviewing Assignments (deadline: 8 March)

1 message

Alistair Moffat <ammoffat@unimelb.edu.au>  
Reply-To: Alistair Moffat <ammoffat@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Adriano Veloso <adrianov@dcc.ufmg.br>  
Cc: SIGIR 2015 <sigir2015@confmaster.net>

Thu, Feb 12, 2015 at 3:22 AM

Dear Adriano,

In this message:

- Your role as reviewer for SIGIR 2015
- Next steps in the reviewing process
- A reminder of the schedule for SIGIR 2015

Thanks again for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for the SIGIR 2015 conference. Papers have now been assigned to reviewers. The number of papers varies from reviewer to reviewer. If you are one of the people who received a smaller number of papers, we may ask you to help out near the end of the process, with some last-minute urgent reviewing to resolve borderline cases.

There are also further papers currently being assigned through two Conflict of Interest (CoI) review systems. Some of you will get additional emails about those assignments in a few days.

---

### Your Role as Reviewer

---

\*\* Reviews are due 8 March \*\*

For SIGIR 2015, every paper has been assigned a team of five: a Primary Program Committee Member, a Secondary PC Member, and three reviewers. As a reviewer, your job is to provide critical assessments of the papers assigned to you based on the review form that we have prepared (see below). For each paper assigned to you, your review and the reviews by two fellow reviewers will form the basis for a discussion about the paper.

The Primary PCM will lead the discussion, then the Secondary PCM will provide input and feedback where necessary. Based on the discussion, the team of five will arrive at a recommended decision. This recommended decision will be passed on to the Program Chairs and used as input to the Program Committee Meeting.

---

### Next Steps in the Reviewing Process

---

The Primary PCMs have manually assigned papers to you. The process in the ConfMaster system is as follows:

1. Login to <http://sigir2015.confmaster.net> using the account name adrianov. Note that we have combined many of the duplicate accounts we have detected, but are bound to have missed some. If, when you login, you cannot (under Author -> 'View own papers') see a list of \*all\* the submissions you are an author of, please alert us immediately, and we'll go looking for more duplicate accounts.
2. Then go to Reviewer > 'View assigned papers' (in the navigation menu on the left) and verify that you do not have more than seven assignments.

Many of you have well under that many assignments, but do please note that

there are another 60 papers currently being allocated in two different 'conflict of interest' ConfMaster systems. These are being handled via the usual process of cloning all components of the main system, then restricting access to the clones to only the PC Chairs that are non-conflicted with the set of papers in that instance of the system.

Hence you might receive one or two further emails over the next ten days with further reviewing assignments in them, via different ConfMaster URLs but the same login credentials. Please pay careful attention to any such emails, they will \*not\* be simple reminders of this message.

Over all three ConfMaster systems we expect to limit total load on any referee to be at most eight papers.

People with initial total loads that fall below these limits might also be asked to undertake some emergency reviews near the end of the reviewing cycle.

3. Please check all of the papers assigned to you for conflicts of interest (as best as you can identify them) and contact [sigir2015@confmaster.net](mailto:sigir2015@confmaster.net) immediately if you become suspicious that you have been allocated a paper that you perhaps should not have. (This is why merging duplicate accounts is important.) You can download copies of papers by clicking the little diskette icon on the RHS of the summary listing.

4. Please also familiarize yourself with the review form, to make sure you know which dimensions to use when evaluating papers. Click on the (R) button to see the form for any particular paper. The form has nine questions:

- Relevance to SIGIR
- Originality of work
- Technical soundness
- Quality of presentation
- Impact of ideas or results
- Adequacy of citations
- Reproducibility of methods
- Overall recommendation
- Confidence in review

Please assign a score for each of these questions. In the text area below the questions, you should supply a rationale for the scores you have assigned.

Your review is not just a vote for whether the paper will be accepted; it is essential input to a discussion amongst the team of five and to the Program Chairs. You are assisting your PC Members and the Program Chairs by providing arguments for or against acceptance. In some cases there will be divergence amongst reviewers' numerical ratings of the paper; if you provide only a rating and terse summary, without an adequate rationale, it will not be helpful.

Start your review with an assessment of what you take to be the main contribution of the paper. Don't just repeat what the authors say they did, provide your own summary of what you gained by reading the paper.

Whether you like or dislike a paper, please say so in a manner helpful to the authors and informative to your area chairs. (You will be asked to rewrite reviews that don't meet this expectation.)

You will notice a 'Reproducibility of methods' criterion. This question is \*\*not\*\* about the use of proprietary data. It is about whether you think the authors provide sufficient details. Do you think that other researchers would be able to reproduce the method and/or results presented in the paper if they had access to the same or similar resources? Are the descriptions of the methods used detailed and accurate? Given the resources used in the paper, or (if they are unavailable) similar resources, could researchers carry out similar experiments to verify the results? What further description could the authors provide?

In the text box labeled 'Summary of your review', please summarize your main points. It is important to point out weaknesses and validity issues, but it is equally important to identify the contribution of a submission. Ultimately, a submission's acceptance depends on its novel contribution, not perfection. Note again that we are looking for an evaluation of the paper, not just a recommendation, and the least helpful review of all is the one that says 'This is a strong paper and should be accepted'.

One issue that may arise is that authors miss some of the prior research that has been published in the area. This should be regarded as being a fatal flaw only if the missing work critically affects their conclusions; remember, authors will have opportunity to make small editorial change to their papers if/when they are accepted.

If you do regard a paper as being unacceptable because of lack of reference to prior work, you should supply details (DOI's being the most useful way of doing this), so that the authors can understand why you believe their paper should not be accepted.

#### 5. Please enter your reviews before **\*\*8 March 2015\*\***.

Once the discussion phase begins on 9 March, we will send further instructions about your responsibilities and duties. Your assistance does not end with the review. In many cases, the discussion will also demand significant attention.

#### The Schedule

---

Here is the schedule again:

11 February: First-tier reviewers receive papers  
8 March: **\*\*First-tier reviews due\*\***  
9-29 March: Primary PCM and first-tier reviewers discuss papers, primary PCM enter meta-reviews  
26-04 March/April: Secondary PCM audits reviews and inputs confirmations  
5 April: Final recommendation made by Primary PCM  
10-11 April: PC meeting in San Francisco  
20 April: Notifications

And, PS, as is the case with many of our long emails, these instructions have been adapted from ones sent in past years (in particular by the 2014 chairs, Charlie, Peter, and Kal), and we would like to thank them for providing such a comprehensive basis for our own efforts this year.

If you need clarification about any aspect of your role, the process or the schedule, please contact [sigir2015@confmaster.net](mailto:sigir2015@confmaster.net) .

We appreciate your help with SIGIR 2015,  
Mounia, Alistair, Berthier  
SIGIR 2015

<http://sigir2015.confmaster.net>

//////////  
Powered by ConfMaster.net  
//////////