



4608/07 Committee

Denis Kalkofen, Judy Kay, Maud Marchal, Karan Singh, Phoebe Toups Dugas, Pawel Wozniak, Stefanie Zollmann

Additional Reviewers

Stephen MacDonell, Michael Winikoff, Helen Huang, Siu-Wing Chen

Conflicts of Interest

none

Decision

Conference to be ranked as B

Justification

IDC was unranked. They submitted a request for an A rank.

The indicators from the data showed mixed results. On the one hand, established researchers publish at the conference as shown by the 'top people involvement' on the other hand the 25% band in the author strength centile graph is lower than rank B conferences. The conference has an h5 index of 28 and 25% band of the citation centile graph shows that the impact sits between A*/A and B ranked conferences for the same FOR code. In the CCF ranking IDC is C.

The submission numbers reported vary between 102-171 (102,112,171) with acceptance rates between 32-40%. However, from looking at the proceedings it is evident that the submitters have counted both full and short paper submissions in all paper data. In fact in 2022 64 full papers were submitted, with 25 accepted, for an acceptance rate of 39%.

2021 was 78 full papers submitted, 28 accepted, acceptance rate 36%

2020 was 47 full papers published. Submissions and acceptance numbers were not given for full papers specifically.

Also, it was found that the PC list supplied for analysis did not match that pointed to, or that in the proceedings. There were both extra names and missing names in comparison with the public list. It is unclear where the provided PC list came from and the submitter has not responded to an email enquiry. The PC as shown is relatively junior with a median h-index of 11. The established people in the list provided are publishing heavily in the conference. However as it is unclear where the list came from, one cannot put much weight on this.

The data on area leaders is not useful as the selection is too narrow and is biased towards the conference. It also doesn't follow the constraints required and is not selecting leading researchers in a general sense, even if they are the top people publishing in this venue.

Due to the untrustworthiness of some of the data as well as the fact that the centile data is somewhat ambiguous, it was agreed by most of the committee that the conference should be ranked B.