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• Sergey Bereg
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• Sandor Fekete
• Efi Fogel
• David Kirkpatrick,
• Valentin Polishchuk
• Raimund Seidel
• Bettina Speckmann
• Csaba Toth
• Chee Yap

Program Committee
• Local Arrangements Committee (Suresh Venkatasubramanian and Valerio Pascucci)
• Past PC Chairs (John Hershberger, Monique Teillaud and Guenter Rote)
• Sheridan Printing (Lisa Tolles)
• CG Steering Committee (Jack Snoeyink, Chair, Mark de Berg, Secretary, Joe Mitchell, Guenter Rote and Monique Teillaud)

More thanks ...
submitting authors: 290 (379)
invited speakers: Helmut Pottmann and Claudio Silva
external reviewers: 178 (?)
EasyChair conference support system

More thanks ...
• Sept-Oct  Discussion of PC issues
• Oct. 9  First call for papers posted
• Nov. 23  Submission titles & abstracts
• Dec. 2  Full submissions due
• Jan. 15  Preliminary evaluations completed; questions sent to authors
• Jan. 20  Author responses due
• Jan. 24  Full/revised evaluations completed
• Jan. 25 – Feb. 8  Committee deliberations
• Feb. 9-14  Finalize decisions & prepare feedback
• Feb. 14  Notifications sent to authors
• Feb. 17  Edited reviews sent
• 172 titles & abstracts received
• 147 full submissions received (6 were subsequently withdrawn)
• Dec. 3 papers assigned to PC members
  ◦ based on interest/expertise
  ◦ 3 (90), 4 (51) primary reviewers
  ◦ 29-31 papers per PC member
• 178 external reviewers engaged
• 477 reviews
• 49 papers received (non-null) comments/questions following preliminary assessment
• 47+ author responses received
Jan. 24 – Feb. 13 EasyChair-facilitated PC discussion
  ◦ guided (but not determined) by confidence-weighted rankings
  ◦ ~12 rounds of accept/reject proposals
  ◦ considerable discussion of “borderline” cases
  ◦ 47 papers were accepted (33%)
  ◦ 7 papers with weighted average scores at least 2.0 [“a vote for acceptance”] were not accepted

Process – decision phase
Review editing:
- each paper assigned to one PC member
- objectives: collect reviews; clarity/civility; some account of discussion and author response; helpful feedback
- non-objectives: “explanation” of decision; uniformity/consistency of reviews

Decisions and reviews sent “on schedule”
From EasyChair
- acceptance by country
- acceptance by topic
Acceptance by number of authors

- Green bars: accepted
- Red bars: submitted
Acceptance by parity of author set
Submitted and Accepted (historical)
Acceptance Rate (historical)
• Where is our focus...is it understood?
  ◦ theory/applications
  ◦ algorithms/other mathematical foundations
  ◦ results vs. techniques
• What does SoCG acceptance connote?
  ◦ correctness, interest, potential impact...
• What is “value added” of an SoCG paper?
  ◦ For the authors
  ◦ For the community
• Proceedings (non-issue this year)

Issues/Discussion Points
• Process
  ◦ Submission content/format
    • emphasis
    • page limits/style
  ◦ Blind reviewing?
  ◦ Rebuttal?
    • Would opportunity (properly implemented) to respond to questions provide most of the benefit of a full rebuttal?
  ◦ EasyChair submission/review management
  ◦ Electronic PC discussion
This year’s author question/response experiment

- should not be confused with rebuttal!
- required extra work and created some confusion, but could have been implemented less awkwardly
- seemed to be appreciated by most authors
- sought response on ~1/3 of papers (about 1/4 of which were accepted
- clearly impacted the evaluation of >10 submissions
Final thanks...