



Aamir Cheema  
Claudia Hauff  
Gillian Dobbie  
Hua Wang  
Hui Ma  
Lei CHen  
Shazia Sadiq (Chair)  
Uwe Roehm

There were 2 requests to add this conference, one at rank A, one at rank B. It is a relatively new conference having started in 2014. It has a GS h5 index of 23, which is a little low for an A conference, although it is in the top 20 venues in its GS subcategory of data mining and analysis. The median h-index for PC members is 14, with 25 out of 74 PC members being established researchers, which is an acceptable, if slightly low ratio for an A conference. The established researchers are publishing in strong venues, but are not really publishing in DSAA (only 3 papers in 5 years from the established researchers in the PC), possibly showing weak engagement with the conference. The citations for this conference are well below average for all conferences in this FoR code (based on CORE's analysis for 2017, using Elsevier data) which is a concern. It is also in the bottom 50% in its category in both Aminer and the CCF rankings (where it is C). However the calibre of the General Chairs and Program Chairs is strong: many have experience in chairing A\*-ranked conferences such as KDD and SIGMOD and A-ranked such as ECML and are top researchers in the areas eg per their high H-index, ACM and IEEE fellowship, leadership in chairing relevant professional bodies, directing data science research institutions, etc. Also DSAA attracted top computer scientists such as Michael Jordan, Yoshua Bengio, David Donoho, Philip Yu, and Christopher Bishop as keynote speakers as well as top statisticians, physicians, and industry/government practitioners from top vendors etc. relevant to data science. A large proportion of the list of (senior) program committees in the recent three years are highly ranked in analytics and machine learning and continuously serve on DSAA's committees. These people also serve on other CORE A\*/A-ranked conferences in the area including VLDB, SIGMOD, ICDE, KDD, ICDM, ICML, AAAI and IJCAI. Despite some indicators suggesting a ranking of B rather than A, the committee decided this could be added at A, due to the strong reputations of some of the people involved, and the fact that this is a new and somewhat specialised area. It should be re-assessed next round.

One committee member (Roehm) identified a conflict with this conference and was not part of the decision.