NOSSDAV 2021
Sync-up meeting for the TPC
Goals for today

Interact with the NOSSDAV community

Establish a common set of values for reviewing

Describe the process of reviewing

Ultimately improve the review process and the overall quality of reviews
**Agenda**

1. **Introductions**
   - 5 min

2. **Reviewing Process Overview**
   - What is the process
   - 10 min

3. **NOSSDAV Protocol**
   - What the chairs expect
   - 5 min

4. **Open discussion**
   - What makes a good review?
   - What makes a bad review?
   - Your review tips?
   - 20 min

5. **Closing**
   - Next steps
   - 2 min
Introductions

Name

Institution

Topics of interest, area of activity

What are your expectations from NOSSDAV 2021?
Reviewing Process Overview

**First Deadline:** Any paper is welcome.

- The submission can be accepted or rejected directly, or invited to be revised and resubmitted.
- Rejected papers cannot be resubmitted to the next deadline.
- The authors of the accepted papers are encouraged to apply for Artifact Review and Badging.
- Note that the papers invited to be revised and resubmitted are not tentatively accepted. Upon resubmission, they will be reconsidered, however, there is no guarantee of final acceptance.

**Second Deadline:** Any paper is welcome (except the ones that were rejected at the first deadline).

- The submission will be accepted or rejected.
- Due to the time constraints, the authors of the accepted papers at this deadline cannot apply for Artifact Review and Badging.
- Authors interested in a badge should consider submitting their artifact to the Open Dataset and Software Track of MMSys'21, noting the earlier submission deadline for that track.
## Reviewing Process Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration deadline</td>
<td>December 11</td>
<td>March 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper submission deadline</td>
<td>December 14</td>
<td>March 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding phase</td>
<td>December 11-15</td>
<td>March 5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>March 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review due</td>
<td>January 20</td>
<td>March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>April 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paper Bidding

- Select your topics of interest
- Fill out the review preferences for each paper
Help oversee the review process to ensure that the reviews are high quality, constructive and overall useful.
Notes on Reviewing

• Be positive and constructive, look for reasons to accept the paper

• Keep in mind that this might be a student’s first paper

• We welcome early work on exciting topics, presenting brave out-of-the-box ideas

  exciting-even-if-incomplete > complete-but-boring

• We welcome papers that enable the scientific community to build on top

  • Tangible: Sharing datasets and code should be the norm

  • Intangible: Contributing to an open conversation, identifying new challenges

  opening-problem > finding-solution
The summary is helpful both for reviewers (to sum up with their own words what they understood) and the authors (who may be surprised to read what the external reviewers actually understood).

Very few people use the Strong Accept. Don’t be shy! It is here for a good reason (e.g. toward best paper award).

Be brief, it is mostly helpful to sort the main strengths and weaknesses.

Say here how the paper can help the community and why this paper will be useful to others.

All the comments you want to say: the longer the better!