

Evaluating the “Learning on Graphs” Conference Experience

Bastian Rieck and Corinna Coupette

With machine learning conferences growing ever larger, and reviewing processes becoming increasingly elaborate, more data-driven insights into their workings are required. In this report, we present the results of a survey accompanying the first “Learning on Graphs” (LoG) Conference. The survey was directed to evaluate the submission and review process from different perspectives, including authors, reviewers, and area chairs alike.

Motivation

The first “Learning on Graphs” (LoG) Conference (9–12 December, 2022) was remarkable in more ways than one: starting from scratch, the conference aims to be *the* place for graph learning research, making use of an advisory committee that consists of international experts in the field. Moreover, at its core, LoG wants to be known for its exceptional review quality. With reviewing being an often-criticized process, marred by strong opinions that are held with high confidence, LoG implemented three measures for improving review quality: (i) using sponsors to provide high monetary rewards for the best reviewers, (ii) vetting reviewers in advance, and (iii) assigning a smaller number of papers to the reviewers than other machine learning conferences. The effectiveness of these measures can only be assessed holistically, which is why the authors of this report decided early on that a large-scale survey should accompany the conference. Such surveys are done regularly by conferences, but few, if any, appear to result in *actionable changes* to the way conferences are run.

Against this background, the results described in this report are aimed to engage the community, make the reviewing process more transparent, and, overall, serve as a way to challenge parts of the *status quo* of running a conference. As our communities grow, our processes, too, must adapt. We cannot run the conferences of the 21st century following procedures developed for community sizes of the 20th century.

Related Work

Previous conferences, such as NeurIPS 2021, already rolled out surveys to assess certain aspect of the reviewing process [1], referencing a famous experiment at NeurIPS 2014 [2]. Such surveys and experiments serve to highlight inconsistencies in the decision-making process *per se*, and provide some encouragement to authors.¹ However, the size of NeurIPS and other conferences poses an obstacle to imple-

¹ To quote Beygelzimer et al. [1]: “Finally, we would encourage authors to avoid excessive discouragement from rejections as there is a real possibility that the result says more about the review process than the paper.”

menting large-scale changes, primarily because the program committee changes every year and knowledge transfer is not guaranteed. LoG, by contrast, is positioned favorably because its research field is just emerging, being at least an order of magnitude smaller than NeurIPS. Moreover, the advisory committee guarantees a certain level of consistency in decisions. We hope that the results of our survey encourage other conferences to take a critical look at their underlying processes. To quote Lord Kelvin [3, pp. 73–74]:

I often say that when you can measure what you are speaking about, and express it in numbers, you know something about it; but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meagre and unsatisfactory kind: it may be the beginning of knowledge, but you have scarcely, in your thoughts, advanced to the stage of science, whatever the matter may be.

We hope that this survey begets knowledge that we may harness to improve future versions of LoG and, perchance, other venues as well.

Results

To understand how participants experienced the LoG conference, we distributed a survey of mostly closed, Likert-scaled questions to all authors, reviewers, and area chairs registered via OpenReview between from late November 2022 to mid February 2023. In this section, we present the results of the survey.² In particular, for each part of the survey, we visualize the results for each question, providing the absolute numbers in the main visualization as well as the percentages in the marginals (for single-choice questions), and using n to indicate the number of respondents (which might differ from the number of responses when multiple simultaneous responses were allowed).


² For reproducibility, we make the response data and the code generating our analyses, excluding all sensitive information, available at the following DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.7875377](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7875377).


Sample Composition

The survey was distributed to 162 active submissions and we received $n = 183$ answers. Our breakdown of roles³ indicates that 92 out of 876 authors responded (10.5% of all authors or up to 50.2% of all active submissions), 118 out of 372 reviewers (31.7%), and, finally, 3 out of 46 area chairs (6.5%).

³ To retain anonymity, our survey is not linked to paper IDs. We permit *all* authors of a paper to respond to the survey.

What roles did you have in the conference?











Questions to Authors

We find that the overwhelming majority of authors is satisfied (either moderately or extremely so) with the conference as well as the reviews that they received. When it comes to the experience of the rebuttal phase, authors tend to be slightly more neutral, but still positive overall. Interestingly, most authors rate the *standards* of reviewers to be at least as high as those of comparable machine learning conferences—given that this was the first edition of the conference, this is an excellent outcome that vindicates the vetting process of reviewers. The fact that authors found the conference experience to be similar or better than comparable conferences is also an important signal that we consider to bode well for future editions.





As an author, how satisfied are you with the *content* and *quality* of the reviews?







As an author, how satisfied are you with the *tone* and *style* of the reviews?





As an author, how satisfied are you with the rebuttal phase?





As an author, how satisfied are you with your review experience overall?



As an author, how high were the reviewers’ standards compared to other AI/ML conferences you submitted to previously?




As an author, how was your review experience compared to other AI/ML conferences you submitted to previously?




Questions to Reviewers

We find that interest in the conference topic is the factor most frequently mentioned as a motivation to review for LoG, followed by the prospect of a monetary reward, and being asked to review based on one’s own professional network. Moreover, reviewers are moderately satisfied with the rebuttal phase and the review experience overall, mentioning that their experience is comparable to those of more established conferences. More than 50% of the reviewers also report that their review load was slightly lower or much lower in comparison to other conferences. Given that the program committee assigned virtually all reviewers no more than 3 papers (with few exceptions for certain expert and emergency reviewers, who were assigned up to 5 papers), the feedback provides a good justification for continuing to keep the review load low.

As a reviewer, why did you choose to review for the conference?





All reviewers who indicated that they were motivated by the monetary rewards offered to best reviewers also indicated that they were motivated by at least one other factor:







Among the responses given in text form, reviewers stated that they were either recruited as an emergency reviewer ($n = 1$) or chose LoG because of the reputation of the organizers ($n = 1$).




As a reviewer, how satisfied are you with the rebuttal phase?






As a reviewer, how satisfied are you with your review experience overall?



As a reviewer, how was your review experience compared to other AI/ML conferences you reviewed for previously?




As a reviewer, how was your workload compared to other AI/ML conferences you reviewed for previously?



About 30% of responding reviewers indicated that they reviewed for ICLR 2023 while reviewing for LoG, with the median affirmative respondent reviewing 5–6 papers for ICLR 2023. Most affected reviewers were neutral or critical toward their double duty. This highlights the importance of conference timing when calibrating reviewer workloads.

Did you review for ICLR 2023?



All respondents:




Reviewer-only respondents:




Reviewer + author respondents:




How many papers did you review for ICLR 2023?



All respondents:




Reviewer-only respondents:




Reviewer + author respondents:




If you reviewed for ICLR 2023: How do you feel about reviewing for ICLR and LoG at the same time?




All respondents:



Reviewer-only respondents:



Reviewer + author respondents:



Questions to Area Chairs

We refrain from illustrating area chairs’ responses due to their small number ($n = 3$).

As an area chair, how satisfied are you with your review experience overall? Responding area chairs were somewhat or extremely satisfied with their review experience overall.

As an area chair, how was your review experience compared to other AI/ML conferences you reviewed for previously? Responding area chairs judged their review experience to be much better or about the same as for other AI/ML conferences they reviewed for previously.

As an area chair, how was your workload compared to other AI/ML conferences you reviewed for previously? Responding area chairs judged their workload to be slightly lower than or about the same as for other AI/ML conferences they reviewed for previously.

General Questions


We also gave participants the option to answer questions about the current setup of the conference (one track for full papers and one track for extended abstracts) and provided options for free-form feedback. The latter received $n = 51$ responses, which we summarize below.

How could we improve your review experience?


In general, most respondents wanted to have more time to discuss their papers with reviewers and mentioned that reviewers should be encouraged to be more *active* during the rebuttal phase. Some commenters raised unreasonable demands by reviewers, such as irrelevant experiments and out-of-scope citations, as a prevailing issue of machine learning conferences that they did *not* experience with LoG. A prevalent wish was also to enable rating of reviewers by authors, as well as to establish a better culture of reviewing that moves away from mere numerical scores. Paraphrasing the respondents here, there appears to be a call for more nuance in the reviewing process. Interestingly, several respondents strongly suggested the utility of enabling public comments on submissions to engage the community in the reviewing process. Finally, some commenters took the time to remark that their experience stood out in positive terms when compared to other conferences.

Concerning the different tracks, respondents commented that the separation should be explained better to authors and reviewers alike. With reviewers having similarly high standards for work that is clearly still in progress, getting an extended abstract accepted was perceived as a tough challenge for authors.


How do you like the “Extended Abstract” track?




All respondents:



Author-only respondents:



Reviewer-only respondents:



Author + {reviewer, chair} respondents:



Why do you not like the “Extended Abstract” track?

We received $n = 19$ text responses. The main issues raised by commenters concern a (perceived) lack of quality of extended abstracts, with some respondents citing fears of using such extended abstracts as a way to perform “idea registration” rather than in-depth analyses. Moreover, respondents also stated that reviewing such submissions is more complex since the standards for acceptance would have to be adjusted accordingly.

Why do you like the “Extended Abstract” track?

We received $n = 28$ text responses. Almost every comment highlights the possibility to submit early work or preliminary work and get quick feedback by the community. Some respondents also consider this track to be advantageous to present non-traditional work, such as critique papers or papers that focus on highlighting negative results.

Anything else you would like to tell us?

We received $n = 24$ responses. Many respondents expressed the wish of seeing more instances of LoG, as well as moving to a hybrid format. One respondent specifically requested a track for survey papers, while another raised frustrations about the OpenReview platform. Finally, one respondent provided helpful insights for further improving the review quality, in particular as the conference grows.

Discussion

The overall responses of the community and the general interest in a second version of the conference paint a positive picture of the first instance of LoG. Analyzing the experiences in more detail, we find that LoG is a microcosm of issues that are known to plague the machine learning community at large. These issues, unsurprisingly, are predominantly concerns about aspects of peer review, including the ensuing discussion between reviewers and authors. We are excited to see that, despite LoG being a “grassroots conference” arising *from* the community and *for* the community, respondents often rate this conference to have provided them with the “best review experience” so far. Authors conceded that reviewer standards were even slightly higher than at comparable conferences, while also citing an overall better experience with the review process.

These positive experiences contrast with some negative experiences of authors. An analysis⁴ of the discussions shows that there are $n = 29$ “silent papers,” i.e., papers with no in-depth discussion between authors and reviewers. While $n = 2$ of these papers were eventually accepted because of strong reviews—which, in some sense, obviated the need for a discussion—this leaves $n = 27$ papers without an exchange. Of these papers, $n = 18$ received no comments from authors, meaning that the authors did not comment on the reviews. This could indicate a misunderstanding regarding the potential utility of a rebuttal, or it could mean that authors did not think that the opinions of reviewers could be changed. Believing in the autonomy of authors, one could say that the review process worked “as designed” for these $n = 18$ cases: authors sent in their work, authors received feedback, but *chose* not to engage further. However, this leaves $n = 9$ papers that were eventually rejected without reviewers commenting on a rebuttal provided by authors. These are clear *failures* of the review process, since we would at the very least expect reviewers to explicitly acknowledge the rebuttal. A brief comparison to other conferences shows that the relative numbers of such papers are extremely low, indicating that overall engagement of reviewers at LoG was comparatively high. Nevertheless, we will have to improve our processes to avoid such breakdowns in communication.

⁴ Despite the complexity of the API, we find OpenReview to offer an unprecedented level of detail for evaluating a conference.

Suggestions

Given the high quality of the majority of reviews, we will continue our vetting procedure and strive to select reviewers with the utmost care. We will also retain the rating system of reviewers and area chairs, which is a cornerstone of the reviewer awards. While the effect of mon-

etary rewards cannot be fully assessed in our current survey setup, we will nevertheless keep this as one feature of LoG for the next instance of the conference. To further focus on review quality, we will improve the monitoring of the review process, making use of the OpenReview API to find and identify “silent papers” early during the review process. We will also raise this topic with area chairs so that they can better stir and steer such conversations, ensuring that no discussion items are left unanswered.

One of the insights that we have to tackle on a much broader level involves a better tracking of reviewers. While LoG already uses reviewer ratings,⁵ it would be beneficial for the whole machine learning community to adopt a *reviewer reputation* system. Such a system would increase the accountability of reviewers and also serve to highlight those that exhibit “good scientific citizenship.” Beyond monetary awards for a selected set of reviewers, it would be interesting to discuss general reviewer compensation. However, instituting such a system is a policy change fraught with additional questions (as well as administrative and fiscal complications). While it is likely that a proper contract with remuneration would further improve review quality, the contract would also need to be enforced if need be. This suggests the use of impartial and trusted experts to carefully *check* reviews of a conference (raising the follow-up problem of establishing guidelines for identifying, recruiting, remunerating, and overseeing these experts). For LoG, we will ensure that organizers perform this job during the next iteration, so that they can engage with problematic reviewers or authors early on in the reviewing process.

⁵ These ratings are to be taken with a grain of salt, though, since the *outcome* of the review phase constitutes a strong confounding variable. Authors whose papers are rejected may not be willing to concede that they received high-quality reviews.

References

- [1] Alina Beygelzimer, Yann Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. *The NeurIPS 2021 Consistency Experiment*. 2021. URL: <https://blog.neurips.cc/2021/12/08/the-neurips-2021-consistency-experiment/>.
- [2] Corinna Cortes and Neil D. Lawrence. “Inconsistency in Conference Peer Review: Revisiting the 2014 NeurIPS Experiment”. 2021. arXiv: 2109.09774 [cs.DL].
- [3] William Thomson Kelvin. *Popular Lectures and Addresses*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1889. URL: <http://archive.org/details/popularlecturesa01kelvuoft>.