



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)

CP was provided as an "A" comparator. The committee considered it and initially felt that, given the information, it was on the A/B borderline. Positive indicators included having strong chairs. Negative indicators included the somewhat high acceptance rate, that the programme committee had relatively few stronger people (although most of the stronger PC members were active in publishing in CP), and, more significantly, quite low citation data: for both the paper citation centiles and strongest author h5 centiles, CP was well below average for an A-ranked venue. For both metrics there were no papers in the top 10%, and less than 13% in the top 25%. More information was therefore obtained, including reaching out to some key people in the CP community to get clarity on the acceptance rate, and the citation data. The responses clarified the acceptance rates, and indicated that the existence of the journal Constraints was responsible for diverting citations away from the conference papers (once a journal version is published, it's cited rather than the original conference paper). The community response also highlighted the high quality of reviewing. Overall the committee considered their concerns over acceptance rate to have been addressed, but remained somewhat concerned about the low centile citation data (but not specifically the Google h5). The additional information subsequently provided by the community included a number of responses that were based on misunderstandings of the process (see clarifications below). However, it did provide additional useful information relating to the context of the discipline and the composition of the SPC. Overall, taking this information into account, the committee converged on recommending that CP retain its "A" ranking.

Clarifications: (1) Although the comparator report indicated that there was no h5 index, the correct h5 index was obtained, and considered, in the initial discussion. (2) The SPC list is actually meant to be just the SPC (or PC) - it is not meant to include track chairs, or programme chairs. (3) The role of "top 20" people was misunderstood in the reconsideration submission: it is used (in particular for A/A* boundary cases) to clarify whether a venue is the venue of choice for top people. This WPP analysis is distinct from the SPC WPP which assesses the extent to which the SPC is publishing in their own conference. When a conference is submitted as a comparator only the SPC WPP is included, so there is no scope for inappropriate selection of top people. Additionally, despite the term "comparator", the decision to rank a given conference rests on its own merits, not on a comparison to the conference it was submitted as a comparator for.

Note: one committee member abstained from voting due to COI (chair over 10 years ago), but contributed to the discussion.