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Respondents are ACs for these conference...

- ACL 2016: 26 (33.3%)
- ACL 2015: 17 (21.8%)
- NAACL 2016: 25 (32.1%)
- NAACL 2015: 13 (16.7%)
- EMNLP 2015: 13 (16.7%)
How often did you....

- Initiate reviewer discussion
- Initiate reviewer discussion primarily due to author response
- Initiate reviewer discussion primarily due to discrepancy in scores
- Initiate reviewer discussion primarily for some other reason
- Read the author response (when available)
- Read the submitted paper

Legend:
- Almost never (10% or less)
- Infrequently (35% or less)
- Sometimes (around 50%)
- Frequently (65% or more)
- Almost always (90% or more)
- Not applicable
Summary

- Initiate reviewer discussion: usually in response to discrepancy in scores
- Author response: almost always read
How much did you rely on X for making decisions about borderline papers?
Summary for borderline paper

- Review text and discussions **by far** the most important
- Overall scores somewhat important
- Author response a bit less important
- Subtopic scores & reading the paper less important
- Author identity not important
What other information did you rely on (common responses)

- Co-chair (4)
- My own opinion (4)
- Extra reviewer (2)
If you could have one more piece of information to make **better decisions**, what would it be?

- Reviewers' info from past conferences (5)
- Reduce number of 3s / forced choice (2)
- Reviewers to read author response (2)
- Mechanism to get extra reviewer (2)
- Reviewers to participate in discussion
- Better review quality
- Knowing that the authors would do as asked
- Half points for overall recommendation
- More time to make decisions
- Training data to learn how to make A/R decisions from
- List of papers merits and flaws
Recommendations to board & future PCs

- Reviewer discussion very helpful, can we make this a "one click" mechanism?
- Make it easier to assign fourth reviewers very quickly (and give a bit more time for decision-making to allow this)
- Figure out a way to do some reviewer history in a way that doesn't violate privacy concerns
- Co-chairs seem to be a good thing
- Remove (most of) the nitty gritty scores
- Author response: who knows, but at least the ACs are reading them!