

Guidelines for Area Chairs

Area chairs initiate and guide reviewer discussions and write meta-reviews for papers that provide crucial information to make the final decisions about acceptance for the EDM 2023 conference. We very much appreciate the time and attention that you give to these responsibilities.

Information on ethics reviews:

For this year's EDM conference, we are paying **special attention to questions related to fairness, equity, and positive social impacts** of the submissions. We presented authors with a list of questions to consider when preparing the submission. Furthermore, we asked the reviewers to answer the following four questions for the submissions assigned to them:

1. *Have you provided demographic information on the population involved in any studies or the population in any datasets that are used?*
2. *If new data are collected, have you described how participants' privacy rights were respected in the data collection process?*
3. *Have you discussed both potential positive and negative educational impacts of the proposed research artifact or application?*
4. *Have you discussed possible ethical concerns related to the work?*

Finally, we asked the reviewers to also flag potential papers for an additional ethics review. If you are the area chair of a submission flagged for additional ethics review: the ethics review will be uploaded by March 15, please take this review into account during the discussion phase and when preparing your metareview.

If your submission is not flagged, we ask you to pay special attention to question 2 (on participants' privacy right): if at least one reviewer of your submission has indicated that participants' privacy rights were not respected (by answering "No" to question 2), please also indicate this in your metareview.

Information on rebuttal phase:

In EDM 2023, we have instituted a few changes in the reviewing process which we think will improve the overall reviewing process and quality. Specifically, we have given authors the opportunity to present a rebuttal to clarify any misunderstandings, answer reviewer questions, etc. The rebuttal phase ends on March 10, 2023 (23:59, AOE). Immediately after the rebuttal phase has ended, please check that each of the papers for which you have been assigned to be the area chair have an author response. If the response is missing, please do get in touch with the EDM 2023 program chairs (Mingyu Feng, Tanja Käser, Partha Talukdar).

Guidelines for the discussion:

You can initiate the discussion phase immediately after the end of the rebuttal phase. During the discussion, please take into account the response of the authors. As soon as the reviewers are in agreement, you might write the meta-review (see below for guidelines) and then initiate a discussion in which you ask reviewers whether they agree with the metareview or have anything they feel was not well represented. If the reviewers are not in agreement, then please initiate a discussion on EasyChair among the reviewers to try to work out disagreements and come to some consensus. It is not necessary that all reviewers agree about their numeric ranking, but discussion of large differences in ranking or disagreements about the claims or merit of a paper can uncover and address misunderstandings.

Guidelines for meta-reviews:

Based on the reviews from the other PC members and the response of the authors, you should write a meta-review that provides an overall recommendation for Accept or Reject (including the strength of that recommendation) and summarizing the main reasons for that recommendation, drawing on the points that were common across reviews and most important in any discussion of the paper among reviewers. Your meta-review should be about a paragraph long and should be sure to draw on all of the reviews and the authors' response, and address fairness, equity, and positive social impacts, when relevant. You should use your judgment to decide on the relative importance of some of the points brought up by you and other reviewers; if some reviewers believe they have less expertise, this should be considered in evaluating their comments.

In some cases, the reviews or discussion may suggest that the paper should be accepted as something other than the category in which it was submitted. For example, the reviewers might suggest that the contribution is not large enough for a full paper, but that the methodology and analyses are sound and thus that a short paper (or poster) would be more appropriate. We cannot change the EasyChair metareview page to collect this information from a multiple-choice selection. Instead, in the confidential information to program committee box on the metareview page, please indicate one of the following recommendations, based on taking the totality of the reviews into account:

- Recommend acceptance in submitted category
- Recommend acceptance as a short paper instead of submitted category
- Recommend acceptance as a poster paper instead of submitted category
- Recommend rejection

You might recommend acceptance in a different format due to concerns on the part of the reviewers about the size of the contribution or about the work being less fleshed out. However, if the reviewers agree that there are significant issues in the accuracy or methodology, that likely suggests a rejection rather than acceptance in another form.