Key:

Two phase review process

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

	10%	7%	20%	32%	30%	99	3.7	0.3		40%
R1	16%	9%	28%	28%	19%	32	3.3	0.1	1.3	34%
R2	16%	10%	19%	26%	29%	31	3.4	0.2	1.4	45%
A	0%	3%	14%	42%	42%	36	4.2	0.6	0.8	42%

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

	3%	2%	5%	22%	68%	99	4.5	0.7		71%
R1	6%	3%	9%	19%	63%	32	4.3	0.6	1.2	69%
R2	3%	3%	6%	19%	68%	31	4.5	0.7	1.0	71%
A	0%	0%	0%	28%	72%	36	4.7	0.9	0.5	72%

Early notification of phase one decisions helps authors.

	4%	5%	11%	24%	56%	99	4.2	0.6		60%
R1	6%	6%	19%	22%	47%	32	4.0	0.5	1.2	53%
R2	6%	3%	13%	23%	55%	31	4.2	0.6	1.2	61%
A	0%	6%	3%	28%	64%	36	4.5	0.8	0.8	64%

Review process and quality

I prefer the policy that author identity remains anonymous in phase one.

No average: only phase one rejects were asked this question

R1	3%	3%	19%	19%	56%	32	4.2	0.6	1.1	59%

I am pleased that author identity remained anonymous until the PC meeting

	8%	6%	26%	20%	40%	65	3.8	0.4		48%

Phase one rejects were not asked this question

R2	6%	3%	29%	23%	39%	31	3.8	0.4	1.2	45%
A	9%	9%	24%	18%	41%	34	3.7	0.4	1.3	50%

I would prefer a blind-until-accept policy.

	10%	7%	24%	18%	40%	98	3.7	0.4		50%
R1	9%	0%	25%	19%	47%	32	3.9	0.5	1.3	56%
R2	19%	0%	19%	16%	45%	31	3.7	0.3	1.5	65%
A	3%	20%	29%	20%	29%	35	3.5	0.3	1.2	31%

Authors should wherever possible be given the opportunity to rebut reviews (including late reviews)

	0%	2%	3%	8%	88%	66	4.8	0.9		88%

Phase one rejects were not asked this question

R2	0%	3%	3%	0%	93%	30	4.8	0.9	0.6	93%
A	0%	0%	3%	14%	83%	36	4.8	0.9	0.5	83%

The reviews for my submissions were constructive and professional.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	12%	16%	27%	26%	18%	99	3.2	0.1		30%
R1	22%	25%	34%	6%	13%	32	2.6	-0.2	1.3	34%
R2	16%	23%	32%	19%	10%	31	2.8	-0.1	1.2	26%
A	0%	3%	17%	50%	31%	36	4.1	0.5	0.8	31%

The reviews I received for PLDI'15 were sufficiently expert.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	21%	22%	15%	24%	17%	99	2.9	0.0		38%
R1	38%	28%	19%	9%	6%	32	2.2	-0.4	1.2	44%
R2	29%	39%	6%	16%	10%	31	2.4	-0.3	1.3	39%
A	0%	3%	19%	44%	33%	36	4.1	0.5	0.8	33%

All submissions should receive the same number of reviews.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	14%	28%	30%	11%	17%	98	2.9	-0.1		32%
R1	3%	9%	53%	9%	25%	32	3.4	0.2	1.1	28%
R2	23%	29%	19%	13%	16%	31	2.7	-0.1	1.4	39%
A	17%	43%	17%	11%	11%	35	2.6	-0.2	1.2	29%

It is sufficient for some submissions to only have three review

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	8%	12%	30%	28%	22%	98	3.4	0.2		31%
R1	16%	13%	28%	19%	25%	32	3.3	0.1	1.4	41%
R2	10%	10%	32%	29%	19%	31	3.4	0.2	1.2	29%
A	0%	14%	29%	34%	23%	35	3.7	0.3	1.0	23%

Expertise grades should be made visible to authors.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	0%	2%	12%	18%	68%	99	4.5	0.8		68%
R1	0%	6%	9%	16%	69%	32	4.5	0.7	0.9	69%
R2	0%	0%	16%	13%	71%	31	4.5	0.8	0.8	71%
A	0%	0%	11%	25%	64%	36	4.5	0.8	0.7	64%

I would prefer it if reviewer grades were not visible at author response time.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	76%	15%	4%	3%	2%	99	1.4	-0.8		78%
R1	81%	9%	3%	3%	3%	32	1.4	-0.8	0.9	84%
R2	71%	19%	3%	6%	0%	31	1.5	-0.8	0.9	71%
A	75%	17%	6%	0%	3%	36	1.4	-0.8	0.8	78%

A binary accept/reject grade feels too hars

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	12%	15%	20%	21%	31%	98	3.4	0.2		43%
R1	13%	9%	16%	16%	47%	32	3.8	0.4	1.5	59%
R2	10%	17%	23%	13%	37%	30	3.5	0.3	1.4	47%
A	14%	19%	22%	33%	11%	36	3.1	0.0	1.3	25%

Paper submission and formatting requirements

Instructions provided to authors were helpful.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	0%	2%	19%	37%	42%	98	4.2	0.6		42%
R1	0%	0%	23%	39%	39%	31	4.2	0.6	0.8	39%
R2	0%	6%	29%	39%	26%	31	3.8	0.4	0.9	26%
A	0%	0%	8%	33%	58%	36	4.5	0.8	0.7	58%

The sigplanconf.cls should support a single option that captures all formatting requirements for a given conference.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	1%	2%	19%	17%	60%	98	4.3	0.7		61%
R1	0%	0%	25%	16%	59%	32	4.3	0.7	0.9	59%
R2	0%	7%	23%	20%	50%	30	4.1	0.6	1.0	50%
A1	3%	0%	11%	17%	69%	36	4.5	0.8	0.9	72%

It is important that each SIGPLAN conference has the same formatting requirements for paper submissions.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N	Mean	Score		Top%
	3%	14%	20%	24%	38%	99	3.8	0.4		41%
R1	6%	19%	19%	22%	34%	32	3.6	0.3	1.3	41%
R2	0%	13%	29%	23%	35%	31	3.8	0.4	1.1	35%
A	3%	11%	14%	28%	44%	36	4.0	0.5	1.1	47%

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

	2%	1%	4%	11%	82%	99	4.7	0.8		84%
R1	0%	0%	3%	22%	75%	32	4.7	0.9	0.5	75%
R2	0%	3%	3%	6%	87%	31	4.8	0.9	0.7	87%
A	6%	0%	6%	6%	83%	36	4.6	0.8	1.0	89%

The page limit for PLDI'15 was about right.

	8%	14%	15%	36%	26%	99	3.6	0.3		34%
R1	3%	22%	13%	41%	22%	32	3.6	0.3	1.2	25%
R2	10%	10%	13%	35%	32%	31	3.7	0.4	1.3	42%
A	11%	11%	19%	33%	25%	36	3.5	0.3	1.3	36%

The use of 10pt font size for submissions is a good move.

	7%	7%	25%	30%	30%	99	3.7	0.3		37%
R1	9%	9%	28%	31%	22%	32	3.5	0.2	1.2	31%
R2	3%	3%	32%	32%	29%	31	3.8	0.4	1.0	32%
A	8%	8%	17%	28%	39%	36	3.8	0.4	1.3	47%

The use of author-year citation style is an improvement.

	27%	15%	31%	13%	14%	98	2.7	-0.1		41%
R1	39%	13%	26%	13%	10%	31	2.4	-0.3	1.4	48%
R2	23%	16%	39%	10%	13%	31	2.7	-0.1	1.3	35%
A	19%	17%	28%	17%	19%	36	3.0	0.0	1.4	39%

Overall feedback

The committee has been fair in its decision regarding my submission(s).

	19%	17%	15%	24%	26%	96	3.2	0.1		45%
R1	34%	25%	16%	19%	6%	32	2.4	-0.3	1.3	41%
R2	23%	27%	27%	17%	7%	30	2.6	-0.2	1.2	30%
A	0%	0%	3%	35%	62%	34	4.6	0.8	0.6	62%