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THANKS!

Submitting authors

Steering committee
   Pankaj Agarwal, Jeff Erickson (SoCG’07), Marc van Kreveld, Joe Mitchell, Günter Rote (SoCG’05 scoring instructions) for their trust

Program Committee
   Marc (chaired my papers marked with ’conflict of interest’)

Subreviewers for their precious work

David Mount and Sándor Fekete for easy collaboration
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Agenda

- October 5: Call for papers sent to various mailing lists
- November 21: Paper titles and abstracts due
- December 3: Paper submissions due
- February 14: Notification of acceptance or rejection
Agenda

- June 2007—: PC discussions about process...
- October 5: Call for papers sent to various mailing lists
- November 21: Paper titles and abstracts due
- Bidding and paper assignments
- December 3: Paper submissions due
- Assignments fixed
- December 4 – January 20: Review
- January 21 – February 8: Electronic discussion
- February 14, 12: Notification of acceptance or rejection
- February 14: Feedback to authors
Review process
No face-to-face meeting

- in spite of Sylvain Lazard’s invitation (Barbados workshop) thanks!
- nice experience in 2005 (Joe+Günter)
- if meeting, every PC member must attend, otherwise his opinion does not count
- time to discuss, ask for additional opinions, read papers again, think...
- archives of written discussions
- less bias: people speak more or less loudly, are more or less talkative, more or less fast, more or less shy, more or less fluent in English, more or less experienced, more or less famous, more or less physically impressive,...
Review process

Each paper was assigned to 4 PC members
Each PC member reviewed at most 33 papers
The PC was helped by 267 subreviewers

Scoring instructions publicly accessible
Review process

Tools

- Easychair
- archived private mailing list
- protected web site (deadlines, guidelines, etc)
- Excel...
Strict deadlines

155 abstracts submitted
  some papers withdrawn before submission deadline
  some papers never submitted

130 submitted papers
  3 papers subsequently withdrawn

42 accepted papers

Acceptance rate: 32% (33%)
stability in 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>authors</th>
<th>submitted</th>
<th>accepted</th>
<th>acceptance rate</th>
<th>PC members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistics
Number of authors

- 4.0% of papers had 1 author
- 34.0% of papers had 2 authors
- 36.0% of papers had 3 authors
- 19.0% of papers had 4 authors
- 10.0% of papers had 5 authors
- 7.0% of papers had 6 authors
- 3.0% of papers had 7 authors
- 2.0% of papers had 8 authors

17 papers were rejected, and 25 papers were accepted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic</th>
<th>submissions</th>
<th>accepted</th>
<th>acceptance rate</th>
<th>PC members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machine learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database systems, robotics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computational biology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer-aided design and manufacturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific computing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differential geometry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensor networks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geographic information systems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerical issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>algebraic objects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer graphics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimentation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meshing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graph drawing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geometric modeling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower bounds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high dimensions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathematical issues</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimization</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triangulations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polygons, polyhedra</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrangements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computational topology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data structures</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points, lines, hyperplanes, segments...</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combinatorial geometry</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>algorithms</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistics

Topics

Statistics are very approximate

Low number of submissions
Low acceptance rate (meaningful?)
of experiments/implementation/application papers

Appropriate criteria

- state of the art of previous implementations
- comparison with previous known results on the same topic
- details on the method
- convincing tests (diverse, numerous, realistic) and interpretation
- novelty, deepness, difficulty of the work
Statistics

Conjecture

100% accepted papers had been submitted
0% rejected papers among non-submitted papers
Feedback to authors

Goals:
- send useful information to authors
- avoid misunderstandings, bad feelings,...
Feedback to authors

Goals:
- send useful information to authors
- avoid misunderstandings, bad feelings, ...

For each submitted paper, one PC member in charge
- removed: really confidential parts (only a few)
- removed: mistakes by reviewers that were corrected by other reviewers
- included: divergent opinions of reviewers
- added when applicable: summary of discussions
Questions/remarks

Possible topics for discussion

- Format of submission
- Abstract submission
- Easychair
- Sheridan printing
- Proceedings cover page
Some authors are asking for a submission in final form.
Nobody wants to review > 30 papers in double-column format and tiny fonts...

→ still 11-point font and single column.

Future: allow more pages? (how many?)
Questions/remarks

Abstract submission

- list of abstracts: useful for bidding
- assignments: easy with Easychair
- PC ready to start reviewing when papers arrive
Questions/remarks
Abstract submission

- list of abstracts: useful for bidding
- assignments: easy with Easychair
- PC ready to start reviewing when papers arrive
- some papers are finally not submitted
  ➞ manual fixes in assignments required
Questions/remarks
Abstract submission

- list of abstracts: useful for bidding
- assignments: easy with Easychair
- PC ready to start reviewing when papers arrive
- some papers are finally not submitted
  \[\Rightarrow\] manual fixes in assignments required
- impossible with Easychair (?) to automatically reject papers submitted without prior abstract submission
  \[\Rightarrow\] manual rejection after automatic acceptance of paper submissions
Questions/remarks
Easychair

CONS

• mistakes of authors
  ex: new submission for paper instead of modification of abstract submission, etc
  ⇒ manual fixes needed

• assignments heavily impacted by strategies of PC members when bidding
  ⇒ manual fixes needed

• limited access to internal database
  ex: no list of PC members for a paper (only reverse)
  ex: no sorting of papers by score discrepancy

• printing table of status of papers impossible
  (seems to depend on the browser used)
  ⇒ manual copy-paste to Excel...!
Questions/remarks
Easychair

PROS

- easy to use, intuitive
- rather flexible, adaptable
- never failed during the process

not perfect, but very good tool

to PC chair: be careful, “undo” does not exist!
Questions/remarks
Easychair

PROS

- easy to use, intuitive
- rather flexible, adaptable
- never failed during the process

not perfect, but very good tool

to PC chair: be careful, “undo” does not exist!

Security...? Confidentiality...? What if the Easychair computers are attacked...?
example:

- Easychair allows several corresponding authors
- I sent the whole list to Sheridan
- Only one corresponding author was kept by Sheridan
  ⇒ the other authors did not get the instructions for camera-ready versions
The minimum convex cover for a simple polygon might need to employ vertices that do not lie on the arrangement of lines induced by the extension of the edges of the polygon.

The central diamond covers the five gaps left by the union of the eight isothetic rectangles.

"The complexity of computing minimum convex covers for polygons"
Questions
Proceedings cover page

- new “ACM Visual Identity Standard”:
  - completely different cover page
  - with picture of the conference place
  - no SoCG logo

- second proposal by Sheridan:
  - truncated logo in place of the picture

- so, traditional cover page kept for this year
cover for next years?