

# Publishing in Computer Science

Jan Obdržálek

FI MU

DUVOD, October 15, 2013



INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

# Part I

## Publishing - Conferences

## What are the factors to consider?

- scope
- what appeared there in the last few years
- overall quality/acceptance ratio
- programme committee (PC)
- deadlines

- *Each paper requires 3-4 reviews!*

## Reviewers

- PC members, ~ 15 – 20 papers each
- many distributed to *subreviewers*
- PC member is responsible for the subreviewers, participates in the discussion

## Paper assignment

- PC *bid* for papers, few days after submission deadline
- can be sped up by the *abstracts first* policy
- *conflict of interest* must be declared

- fixed entries
- submitted through a PC member (email), or electronically (Easychair)
- around *4 weeks* turnaround time
- the review can be modified/added to during the PC discussion

## Form entries

- overall score
- detailed review, including justification
- comments for PC
- confidence level

- *timeframe*: 2-3 weeks
- nowadays almost exclusively "distributed"
- first pass: remove *clear accepts and rejects*
- ask for *additional reviews* if necessary
- some papers initiate a long discussion
- *gray zone*: somebody must fight for the paper
- luck always plays part
  
- Rebuttals - not for adding new material!

# Timeframe – a recap

- 1 paper bidding: 2 days – 1 week
- 2 reviews: 4-5 weeks
- 3 (rebuttal: 1 week)
- 4 PC discussion: 2-3 weeks
- 5 full version: 1-2 weeks

## EXAMPLES



## Part II

# Publishing - Journals

## By access

- traditional (*serials crisis*)
- open access (outside funding vs author pays)
- hybrid open access
- delayed open access

## The “big three”

- Elsevier
- Springer
- John Wiley

*More than 42% in CS!*

# Who is in charge?

## Editorial staff

- Editorial board
  - active members
  - ceremonial members
- Associate/assistant editors
  - by topics
  - additional advice to editors
- Chief editor(s)/Editor-in-Chief

## Two types of editors

- academics (may, or may not be paid)
- professional editors (should have at least postdoc experience)

## Differences from conferences

- takes *much longer* (months/years)
- much more *thorough*
- *guided* by the editor
- multiple *iterations*
- decision is not binary (accept/reject)

## Possible outcomes (example)

- accept, no changes
- accept, minor changes (no extra refereeing needed)
- accept, subject to major changes (new round of refereeing)
- reject

- longer (10-50 pages)
- include all details

## Taxonomy

- regular paper
- special issue
  - for a conference/workshop (selected papers only)
  - anniversary (person/area)
  - for active new topics
- survey
- short paper
- editorial

## EXAMPLES