

So you're a CVPR 21 AC.....

- Congratulations!
 - This is an honor
 - The community and PC are relying on your skill and judgement
- AAARGH!
 - It's hard (but not difficult) work
 - You need to be careful, focused and fair
 - You need to make decisions that others will dislike

What happens next - I

- Once we've finished with paper matching to ACs, you'll get a note
- You then use your skill and judgement (and CMT/TPMS scores, etc)
 - to recommend no fewer than 10 referees for each paper
- PCs will then run a matcher, and allocate referees
 - papers go out (nothing for you to do here)
- GOAL: every paper has at least 3 quality reviews
- GOAL: you have the information needed for a fair and accurate decision

What happens next - II

- GOAL: every paper has at least 3 quality reviews
 - Close to review deadline you'll need to
 - watch reviews are coming in
 - nag referees
 - After review deadline, you'll need to
 - keep nagging
 - assign emergency reviewers as needed
 - nag them
- GOAL: you have the information needed for a fair and accurate decision
 - Check reviews - do they make sense?
 - Bug referees to fix, read rebuttal, discuss

Our Principles

- we want to make the best decisions we can to serve the community.
- we want these decisions to be transparent to the authors.
 - While an author may not be happy with a decision, the author should understand why the decision was made.
- we want area chairs to understand what other area chairs are doing, so there is reasonable consistency across area chairs.
- we want points of policy to be understood by all area chairs.
- we want to minimize appeals.

Your job

- Advise the PCs on which papers to accept to CVPR21
 - Using reviews and your skill and judgement
- Ensure that all authors understand the basis of the recommendations
 - By writing a summary explaining recommendation
 - Which should be rooted in reviews, rebuttal and reviewer discussion
- Treat all involved fairly, compassionately and uniformly
 - Choose referees likely to understand paper
 - Understand all issues raised in reviews and rebuttal
 - Do not make policy on-the-fly
- Behave ethically, and expect ethical behavior from others
 - Raise and deal with improprieties in papers
 - Avoid conflicts of interest

HINTS to make your job easier

- Selecting good referees is really helpful
 - For sure, famous names and good referees are not the same thing
 - You may need to trust their judgement
 - do this carefully
- Make referees discuss
 - So you know what the response to the rebuttal is
 - even if the outcome seems clear
 - You should at least send every referee a note like
 - 3SA - It's in unless someone rejects?
 - 1SA, 1SR, 1WR - Help?
 - 2SR, 1WA - Is there a champion?
 - etc.

Operating Practices

- all decisions based on reviews, CMT discussions and AC discussions
- all decisions will have consensus of at least two AC's.
- all decisions will have a summary setting out the basis for the decision.
- all summaries will have been checked by another AC using a checklist.
- we will raise and discuss points of policy
- no need to tell authors how to write their papers, or how to improve them

Operating Practices

- if all referees agree that a paper should be rejected, we expect the paper to be accepted ONLY if there are unusual circumstances: examples are
 - a major and obvious referee error
 - a compelling rebuttal that causes referees to change their mind.

- if all referees agree that a paper should be accepted we expect the paper to be rejected ONLY if there are unusual circumstances: examples are
 - a major technical error;
 - fraud or plagiarism not originally detected by referees.

Operating Practices: Triplets

- Much work will be done in AC triplets
 - individual triplets are conflict free
 - you should discuss with your triplet buddies
 - decisions require consensus of primary and secondary AC
 - triplet buddy should help if required
 - triplets will mix experienced and junior ACs
- Do not discuss papers across triplets EXCEPT if so instructed
 - you may ask for a conflict free opinion from outside triplet
 - and PC will find someone

Policy Issues: Plagiarism

Stealing text from another paper, written by other authors

Our procedure:

- DAF investigates, recommends to other PC's who vote accept/reject
 - use IEEE Intellectual Property office standards
- Outcomes:
 - Likely successful prosecution = note to AC, authors, desk reject and referral to IEEE
 - Not likely successful = note to AC, authors

Slow, but moderately effective

AC's: for any charge of plagiarism: refer to DAF, proceed as if charge is FALSE

Policy Issues: Self plagiarism

Reusing text from your own paper.

Our procedure:

- DAF investigates, recommends to other PC's who vote accept/reject
 - use IEEE Intellectual Property office standards
 - Which are confusing.... (essentially, it's improper, but they don't do anything)
- Outcome:
 - note to AC, authors, pointing out policy of IEEE, no further action
- Slow, but moderately effective

AC's: for any charge of plagiarism: refer to DAF, proceed as if charge is FALSE

Policy Issues: Conflicts and self reports

Hard conflicts: CMT helps us, and we enforce

- We have lots of rather squishy soft conflicts
 - Paper might be by a friend;
 - you might have started a collaboration;
 - you owe author a favor;
 - you owe referee a favor; etc.

AC's:

- please self-report uncomfortable situations,
 - We'll figure out how to cope
 - Self-report even if you think you can manage

Policy Issues: Don't write papers for authors

Script: Referee/AC reads paper, sees ways in which it could be better, recommends changes which authors refuse to adopt.

Suggested solution: Authors' problem. Also, if it's not acceptable without changes, reject it.

Theory: you can't stop fools from being fools, and it's not worth trying.

We make the best decisions we can based on info, but if you make a suggestion that makes their paper look good, and they want to leave it out of final paper, they really haven't read the memo.

Policy Issues: Suggested changes

Script: Referee/AC reads paper, sees ways in which it could be better, recommends changes which authors refuse to adopt.

Suggested solution: Authors' problem. Also, if it's not acceptable without changes, reject it.

Theory: you can't stop fools from being fools, and it's not worth trying.

We make the best decisions we can based on info, but if you make a suggestion that makes their paper look good, and they want to leave it out of final paper, they really haven't read the memo.

Policy Issues: Extra experiments

Script: Referee wants extra experiments in rebuttal; authors supply (or don't)

Suggested solution: Use your best judgement. You can't reject **because** people **refused** to supply extra experiments. You may find that the experiments supplied pre rebuttal sufficient. You can't reject **because** they supplied extra experiments, either.

Theory: Policy states referees can't require extra experiments.

Policy Issues: Will extra results fit?

Script: Referee asks for extra in rebuttal; author supplies; now there's more material, and we're not sure what will go in paper.

Suggested solution: Authors' problem.

Theory: you can't stop fools from being fools, and it's not worth trying.

We make the best decisions we can based on info, but if they have info that makes their method look good, and they leave it out of final paper, they really haven't read the memo.

Policy Issues: Anonymity and Format Violations

This is all a bit squishy: use your judgement.

- Huge anonymity violations are a desk reject, but small stuff is better just noted in summary.
 - Anonymity theory: we don't want big organizations or famous people bullying referees, but it's rough to reject for being inept at anonymity
- Huge format violations are a desk reject, but small stuff is better just noted in summary.
 - Format theory: we don't want people submitting too much, but it's rough to reject for being bad at LaTeX or English

Policy Issues: Secret datasets

Script: Referee/AC rejects paper as “unscientific” because it’s evaluated on a dataset that can’t be/won’t be/hasn’t been published, so can’t be replicated.

Solution: You really can’t do this. There is no such policy, and you shouldn’t invent policies. Judge situation on its merits.

Theory: You can’t invent policies

If an issue comes up that looks like a matter of policy, raise with a PC and we’ll advise or bring it up in plenary. CVPR generally has very few binding policies, and they’re obvious (no plagiarism; no dual submission; no fraud; math needs to be right; etc).

Policy Issues: Arxiv

Script: Referee rejects paper because there are better results on Arxiv

Solution: You can't do this because Arxiv doesn't exist.

Script: Referee rejects paper because it cites Arxiv

Solution: You can't do this either; authors can cite anything.

Script: Referee rejects paper because it doesn't cite Arxiv

Solution: You can't do this because Arxiv doesn't exist.

Theory: You can't invent policies. Policy is that Arxiv doesn't exist.

Policy Issues: Summaries and Checklist

There will be about 9000 summaries. You will check each others summaries. To simplify, there is a checklist:

Key principle:

- Would a reasonable author object to the summary as a basis for the decision?

Policy Issues: Summary Checklist

- Does the summary mention reviews or referees?
- Did the referees agree?
- If all referees agree, is the summary consistent with that consensus?
 - (if not, it may be OK, but should be scrutinized very carefully, as if the referees disagree; in this case, we expect multiple AC's to be involved, and the summary to be a clear record as below)
- If referees disagree, or make borderline recommendations:
 - Was there a rebuttal?
 - Does the summary mention the rebuttal?
 - Was there a discussion?
 - Does the summary mention the discussion?
 - Does the summary give the main points used to reach the decision?

You can't get away with this...

This sort of thing has been done for years and needs to stop

Paper describes a method that has been known for a while

Majority of reviewers vote X

Two of three reviewers vote reject and there is a rebuttal and I agree with majority

Three borderline reviews, discussion is mixed, there is a rebuttal, but I don't like paper

Policy Issues: Summary Checklist

- Does the summary mention reviews or referees?
- Did the referees agree?
- If all referees agree, is the summary consistent with that consensus?
 - (if not, it may be OK, but should be scrutinized very carefully, as if the referees disagree; in this case, we expect multiple AC's to be involved, and the summary to be a clear record as below)
- If referees disagree, or make borderline recommendations:
 - Was there a rebuttal?
 - Does the summary mention the rebuttal?
 - Was there a discussion?
 - Does the summary mention the discussion?
 - Does the summary give the main points used to reach the decision?

Sample Distributions

Be aware pools differ. History says the accept rate will be about 25%. We have about 250 ACs. Each has about 30 papers. This means:

- about 160 AC's between .17 and .33
 - about 5 papers in 30 to about 10 in 30
- about 36 AC's have accept rates from .33 to .41
 - about 10 in 30 to about 12 in 30
- about 36 AC's have accept rates from .08 to .17
 - about 2 in 30 to about 5 in 30
- about 20 AC's have accept rates greater than .41 OR less than 0.08

Not a license to run wild, but many will have funny pools. We'll keep an eye on progress and update.