

Publications Board Updates/Feedback Requests

Jonathan Aldrich, Carnegie Mellon University
SGB Liaison to the ACM Publications Board

Presented April 23, 2021



Update: ACM is Plan S-Compliant

- Plan S mandates Open Access
 - For all publications supported by cOAlition S sponsors (much of Europe)
 - Starting January 1, 2021
- Work must be published in all-OA venues
 - Publication fees
 - Transformative OA (such as ACM Open)
 - Hybrid venues permitted during transition to a transformative model
- ACM is one of 10 publishers certified as Plan S-compliant
 - We're the only Society on the list
 - All ACM journals are listed as compliant on the Plan S website
 - The website doesn't list conferences – Plan S does not yet have a conference tracker
 - But all ACM conferences are compliant for the same reason as journals

Update: ORCID Rollout

- We discussed ORCID in the last SGB meeting
 - A persistent digital identifier that you own and control, and that distinguishes you from every other researcher
 - Sign up in 3 minutes
 - Will improve data accuracy, help admin systems like ACM Open
- Two ACM journals will start requiring ORCID from corresponding authors in the next month
 - The requirement will roll out in other journals as 2021 progresses
- Conference publication will generally require ORCID starting in 2022

Double-Blind Reviewing and arXiv

- Context: many authors post papers to arXiv as they are prepared
 - Share results with others, without waiting for conference review
 - Establish that work was done by a certain date
 - **These are good reasons. We want to encourage authors to do this!**
- Issue: want to ensure author anonymity for double-blind papers
 - But reviewers may search and find papers on arXiv, websites, etc.
 - Reviewers may be notified when papers appear
 - Either can compromise author anonymity
- Some conferences restrict postings to arXiv around submission time
 - **This is bad! It's against ACM Publications policy. Don't do it.**
 - It prohibits behavior we want to encourage – sharing of scientific results
 - It won't work anyway – authors can still post to websites, where papers can be found

Double-Blind Reviewing and arXiv - Solutions

- Context: many authors post papers to arXiv as they are prepared
 - Share results with others, without waiting for conference review
 - Establish that work was done by a certain date
 - **These are good reasons. We want to encourage authors to do this!**
- Preferred solution: reviewer responsibility
 - By agreeing to reviewer, reviewers agree to maintain double-blind:
 - Not to search for a paper they are reviewing
 - Disable notifications around submission time and during review, if necessary to prevent learning the authors of papers they review
- Discussion?

Use of Reviews Outside the Review Process

- **Motivating case** (<https://ajsangeetha.wordpress.com/2021/02/18/the-journey-of-a-complaint-at-sigcomm-hotnets-2020/>)
 - An author received a review she saw as inappropriate and biased

“Internet infrastructure is located close to Internet users, who live predominantly in developed countries in high latitudes. For the studied topic, this is the population that matters, not the overall world population.”

 - Factually incorrect: most internet users are in developing countries
 - Author felt “this is the population that matters” expresses bias against developing world
 - Note ACM Policy: reviewers are expected to “use appropriate language in a review”
<https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/roles-and-responsibilities>
 - She posted the excerpt on Twitter to highlight the problem

Use of Reviews Outside the Review Process

- **Motivating case** (<https://ajsangeetha.wordpress.com/2021/02/18/the-journey-of-a-complaint-at-sigcomm-hotnets-2020/>)
 - An author received a review she saw as inappropriate and biased
 - She posted the excerpt on Twitter to highlight the problem
 - After some back-and-forth, the author posted excerpts from correspondence
 - The PC chairs told her to ~~take her Twitter posts down, as it was inappropriate to share reviewer comments with anyone~~
 - She reported the situation to the SIG's CARES committee
 - She received initial responses from CARES and the SIG chair telling her ~~she had broken confidentiality and copyright rules~~
 - This was repeated 2 months later
- **All of the above initial feedback was wrong!**
 - **and pretty traumatic to a young researcher**

Use of Reviews Outside the Review Process

ACM Publications Policy

- The author did nothing wrong
 - It's clearly OK for an author to share excerpts of reviews they've received for purposes of criticism
 - Only issue: if an excerpt broke other aspects of confidentiality (e.g. identity of a reviewer)
- Yes, reviewers have copyright
 - That does not allow them to prohibit the fair use of those reviews, which clearly includes the case above
- ACM Publications will look at clarifying the applicable policy
 - When reviewers agree to review, they give the author consent to use their reviews
 - This will be part of upcoming policy reviews (stay tuned!)

Use of Reviews Outside the Review Process

How the situation was resolved

- ACM Publications was able to clarify policy verbally and via email, once asked
 - [post-meeting note: it appears there were miscommunications early on, though—something we need to be aware of and fix for the future]
- SIGCOMM CARES put out a statement
 - Suggesting clarifications to the written policy
 - Discussing bias in reviews and ways to prevent it
 - Suggesting clearer lines of communication within ACM

Use of Reviews Outside the Review Process

Discussion Question: what should the policy on use of reviews say?

- An author can quote a portion of a review (but not the entire review) publicly for the purpose of critiquing it under fair use?
 - Language suggested by the SIGCOMM statement
- Reviewers grant paper authors permission to use the (entire) reviews however they wish?
 - SIGPLAN policy (which extends current ACM policy)
 - *Note: could be restricted to say that authors should not use the reviews in a way that would reveal reviewer identity*

Author Name Change Policy

- Issue: people sometimes change their names
 - Women from maiden to married name
 - Trans people from male to female names or vice versa
 - Non-binary people from gendered to gender-neutral names (e.g. my kid, Seal)
- ACM set an industry-leading policy in 2019
 - <https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/author-name-changes>
 - Authors can request name changes
 - Names will be updated in prior ACM publications & metadata
 - Citing works may be corrected with consent of contact authors of those works
- Implementation status
 - 15-20 requests, 7-8 complete
 - Slow pace has caused frustration; process improvements underway

Author Name Change Policy – Issues

- “Citing works may be corrected with consent of contact authors of those works”
 - Puts others in a position to block name changes
 - Violates a principle: people should control their own names
 - May “out” someone as trans
 - Subjects the trans person to bias, and potentially endangers them
- **New ACM Publications policy** (voted last month, still in implementation)
 - ACM authors by default give ACM permission to correct the names of other people in their papers, without consulting the contact author

Author Name Change Policy – Discussion

- New ACM Publications policy
 - ACM authors **by default** give ACM permission to correct the names of other people in their papers, without consulting the contact author
- Argument for “always”
 - People own their names. It’s no-one else’s business.
 - We should protect trans people from being outed (and the consequences)
- Argument for “by default, with opt out”
 - Authors should be able to control their papers
 - Does “always” go too far? Will there be a backlash that makes things worse?

Should this be “always”? Or can ACM authors opt out?