



2021 4602 Committee

Bing Xue (Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand)

Michael Winikoff (Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand) [chair]

Noa Agmon (Bar Ilan University, Israel)

Serena Villata (Universit Cte dAzur, CNRS, Inria, I3S, France)

Toby Walsh (UNSW, Australia)

Yuan-Fang Li (Monash University, Australia)

CADE was ranked "A" and applied for a rerank to "A\*".

The committee noted a range of factors, both positive and negative. In some years the chairs were quite weak for an A/A\* conference ( $H < 20$ ). The acceptance was quite high. The PC looks strong, and is very active. The Google  $h_5 = 19$ , and  $CCF = B$ . WPP for top people (systematically identified) put CADE 2nd (behind IJCAI) - but unclear how much of this is including IJCAR. Finally, the citation centiles were somewhat weak for an A/A\*. Considering the  $h_5$  (strongest author on each paper), only ~3% were in the top 25% (compared to A/A\* in the area), and ~19% in the top 50%. On the other hand, looking at the citations, ~19% of CADE papers were in the top 25% (relative to other A/A\* in this area), and 58% were in the top 50%.

The comparators were not that convincing:

Comparator 1 (IJCAR): chairs stronger, IJCAR acceptance rate slightly lower (but still high), <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/bfm%3A978-3-030-29436-6%2F1.pdf>

Comparator 2 (CAV): lower acceptance rate, chairs variable, much higher  $h_5 = 38$  - not on the list to evaluate, but appears plausible for A\* despite some anomalies.

Overall, despite some positives, the committee felt that this should retain "A" ranking. It is clearly not A\*, and although some indicators would question the "A" ranking" the committee felt that, holistically, it was justified.

Note: Acceptance numbers for 2019 combine all types of papers. Just full papers is 27/53, i.e. just over 50%