



Michael Winikoff  
Helen Huang  
Dali Kaafar  
Shazia Sadiq  
Weifa Liang  
Mark Billinghamurst  
Geoff Webb  
John Grundy  
Lin Padgham (chaired the process)

FOSSACS was provided as a comparator at rank A and so it was reviewed to assess if that rank is appropriate. It was initially assessed within the context of 4612 (Software Engineering), where it was regarded as B. However it was later agreed that 4613 (Theory of computation) is a more appropriate primary code and it was subsequently re-assessed in that context, following the submission of additional information. It publishes about 30 papers with an acceptance rate of 30+. Its h5 is 20 which is low for a SE A, but acceptable for a theory conference. The median h-index of the PC is 15, with 8 of 23 PC members being established researchers. Only 4 of these published there and only one of them twice. When assessed within the context of 4613, citations data is above the average A/A\* at the 25th centile, with 31% at the 25th centile of A/A\* in 4613.

The additional submission provided a list of 10 top people involved, of which 5 attended often or always. However not much info was given about why they were top people other than an h-index.

A WPP report of 20 top people was provided with selection being by combinations of relevant labels, omitting deceased and retired and then sorting by h-index. This showed FOSSACS was published at 24 times by 9 of 20 experts in the last 11 years (7th position). If run from 2015 as requested it showed FOSSACS was published at 11 times by 7 of 20 individuals in the last 6 years, though 5 of them only in 1 of those years (9th position). Both do show evidence of publishing by top people.

The reconsideration document complains that the PC statistics left out the Chairs, but this was standard for all submissions. Chairs information was provided separately and they were not included as PC members. The additional information around PC data is therefore not relevant. 4 of 8 established researchers publishing there over 5 years and only one of them twice, is still somewhat weak engagement by the established researchers in the PC, but it is a small conference and a relatively small PC. Also, the threshold for established researchers could possibly be lower for CS theory. The median PC h-index was 15 which is certainly acceptable.

After reconsideration the decision was to retain this at rank A, due to strong citations data in the context of CS theory, but with some hesitations due to the apparently low numbers and low engagement of the established researchers on the PC. The evidence of publishing by top people was considered somewhat weak.