

PLDI 2007 SURVEY RESULTS

1.	I am primarily associated with:	
	a. Industry	36
	b. Academia	104
	No reply	1
2.	The tutorials were worthwhile:	
	a. Strongly agree	8
	b. Agree	22
	c. Neutral	39
	d. Disagree	2
	e. Strongly disagree	1
	No reply	69
The following questions address the quality and relevance of the technical program.		
3.	The papers presented interesting material:	
	a. Strongly agree	37
	b. Agree	91
	c. Neutral	8
	d. Disagree	2
	e. Strongly disagree	1
	No reply	2
4.	The talks were well presented:	
	a. Strongly agree	31
	b. Agree	85
	c. Neutral	22
	d. Disagree	2
	e. Strongly disagree	0
	No reply	1
5.	The technical quality of papers presented was:	
	a. Very high	31
	b. High	81
	c. Average	21
	d. Below average	1
	e. No opinion	7
	No reply	0
6.	In regards to your field of work or study, the presented papers were:	
	a. Highly relevant	30
	b. Relevant	66
	c. Somewhat relevant	44
	d. Not relevant	0
	e. No opinion	0
	No Reply	1

The following questions address the length of the conference and the length and number of presentations		
7.	The number of papers accepted was:	
	a. Too many	46
	b. About right	81
	c. Too few	1
	d. No opinion	9
	No reply	4
8.	I prefer that the length of presentations (i.e., talks) be:	
	a. 30 minutes	18
	b. 25 minutes	50
	c. 20 minutes	63
	d. 15 minutes	8
	No reply	2
9.	Currently PLDI is a 2 ½ day conference. The length of PLDI should be:	
	a. 2 days	4
	b. 2 ½ days	52
	c. 3 days	62
	d. longer than 3 days	4
	e. No opinion	16
	No reply	3
10.	PLDI should have separate long and short talk categories:	
	a. Strongly agree	6
	b. Agree	30
	c. Neutral	26
	d. Disagree	45
	e. Strongly disagree	33
	No reply	1
11.	PLDI should consider using dual tracks to accommodate more papers:	
	a. Strongly agree	6
	b. Agree	32
	c. Neutral	21
	d. Disagree	53
	e. Strongly disagree	29
	No reply	0

PLDI 2007 SURVEY RESULTS

12.	PLDI should consider having more invited speakers:	
	a. Strongly agree	16
	b. Agree	41
	c. Neutral	46
	d. Disagree	32
	e. Strongly disagree	6
	No reply	0
The following questions concern giving awards		
13.	PLDI should have a regular best presentation (i.e., best talk) award. (Note that it is difficult to make this fair for the last talks.):	
	a. Strongly agree	16
	b. Agree	41
	c. Neutral	44
	d. Disagree	28
	e. Strongly disagree	12
	No reply	0
14.	In addition to the 10-year retrospective award, PLDI should have a best paper award:	
	a. Strongly agree	30
	b. Agree	61
	c. Neutral	35
	d. Disagree	11
	e. Strongly disagree	4
	No reply	0
The following questions concern the conference venue and logistics:		
15.	The meals and break food was satisfactory:	
	a. Strongly agree	11
	b. Agree	52
	c. Neutral	28
	d. Disagree	30
	e. Strongly disagree	19
	No reply	1

PLDI 2007 SURVEY RESULTS

The following questions concern the conference venue and logistics: (cont.)		
16.	My hotel room was satisfactory:	
	a. Strongly agree	15
	b. Agree	50
	c. Neutral	37
	d. Disagree	21
	e. Strongly disagree	6
	No reply	12
17.	The hotel service and amenities (e.g., internet access, room service, concierge service, etc.) was satisfactory.	
	a. Strongly agree	6
	b. Agree	38
	c. Neutral	43
	d. Disagree	31
	e. Strongly disagree	13
	No reply	10
This section is aimed at the reviewing process.		
18.	PLDI should permit paper submissions by PC members:	
	a. Strongly agree	18
	b. Agree	45
	c. Neutral	37
	d. Disagree	19
	e. Strongly disagree	16
	No reply	6
19.	PLDI 2007 allowed authors to write rebuttals to reviews. I think that author rebuttal is:	
	a. Very useful	36
	b. Useful	74
	c. Neutral	20
	d. Not useful	6
	e. Harmful	0
	No reply	5

PLDI 2007 SURVEY RESULTS

This section is aimed at the reviewing process. (cont.)		
20.	PLDI 2007 used double-blind reviewing (reviewers did not know author identity before the PC meeting). I think double-blind reviewing is:	
	a. Very useful	40
	b. Useful	50
	c. Neutral	30
	d. Not useful	13
	e. Harmful	4
	No reply	4
		0
21.	As a submitting author, the reviews I received were:	
	a. Thorough and fair	34
	b. Somewhat thorough and fair	15
	c. Neutral	14
	d. Not at all thorough and fair	4
	No reply	74
22.	With the possible exception of my own submission(s), the committee did:	
	a. A good job of selecting papers	70
	b. An average job of selecting papers	33
	c. A poor job of accepting papers	20
	No reply	36

COMMENTS:

“Would have been useful to have some way of signaling when talks were open for entering. I know I waited thinking the previous talk was in session when actually the talk I wanted to attend had started.”

“Short question period was even more significant problem than short presentation. Some very good papers, but too marginal.”

“The schedule from 8:00 A.M.-6:00 P.M. and FCRC Evening Events was much too long. We might as well have had dual tracks – I self-selected out of more sessions than usual because of the length of the schedule.”

“Do not dilute PLDI as a mechanism to reach the entire community and as our BEST SIGPLAN Conference – Accept less papers and/or give authors 30 minutes per presentation and at least five minutes for questions! Maybe go to three days no double sessions, please.”

“I prefer 20 minute talks over 30 minute talks.”

“At most one or two non-American papers each year in PLDI. Is it a national conference?”

“Split numeric-only papers into separate track.”

“Internet access in the Conference Center was spotty. Choose a hotel that provides free internet in rooms.”

“We need better wireless at the show!”

“Breakfasts were good, but lunch could have been better. Wireless was very slow during the day – perhaps due to FCRC, but also perhaps because free wireless was only available in the Convention Center, not the hotel rooms.”

“Keep the awards presentation short.”

“Great time, I would have liked to see some low level graphics research. Compilers for GPU's etc. GO BEARS!!”

“Who accepted that silly ETH Paper? (Online optimization driven by MPM) That paper is rubbish and not worthy of PLDI! Besides that, a number of other papers also were quite substandard!”

“Conference wireless service ranged from unreliable to incompetent. When I asked the support person why I couldn't get reliable web connections he replied “too many users”.”

“More central conference location. Better lunches. Less talks/per day (extend conference to three days).”

“Internet access was far too difficult to get and I do not agree that it should be a separate charge for a room. Would be nice to have 20 minute talks w/5 minute Q/A (my preferred format).”

“Dual tracks would help when the number of accepted papers is high. Longer talks would allow the speakers to present more background and give more discussion. We need better wireless access at future PLDI's!”

“This is a terrible hotel with awful location in San Diego. Not possible to walk anywhere. FCRC is useless if conference schedules (talk times) are not synchronized.”

“Would be good to announce the beginning of sessions in the lobby.”

“Six talks in one session are way too many. Consider having short breaks to break up long sessions. I do not have a strong opinion about the conference length or number of acceptances, but this should be correlated. This was too many papers for ...”

“Add excursions. Town & Country should be banned. Need more care in choice of locations (i.e., not Tucson in June) for future PLDI’s.”

“Too many talks per session – Max four not matter what length. Days are too long – fewer talks? Wireless was too overloaded – poor connections when busy.”

“The sessions should end at 5:00 P.M. Starting at 8:00 A.M. or 8:15 A.M. is good.”

“Six talk sessions are hell; wireless Internet was hard to connect to. Thans for organizing the Conference this year!”

- “1. Need power outlet for laptop of conference room.**
- 2. Coffee should be present anytime.**
- 3. Presenter’s name tag should be distinguished.**
- 4. All keynote speech and Turing Award speech were disappointing.”**

“Sessions were too long.”

“Too many presentations in one session; It may be better ≤ 4 and more shorter breaks.”

“Longer, extended versions of selected papers could be invited to a special issue of a journal.”

“Last year there were no keynotes, this year there were the FCRC keynotes (noon and night time). At least one or two keynotes are useful when not co-located. Posters should be acknowledged in the proceedings with a short (half-page) abstract; this would increase submissions (I think).”

“The PC should favour papers exploring unconventional ides (although potentially underdeveloped and lacking bullet-proof implementations because of limited resources (such as the number of co-authors) and take into account that a paper can be improved dramatically in a couple of months from the submission to the conference. Please consider ISCA-type shepherding of papers, especially by young authors.”

“I sympathize with the FCRC scheduling constraints, but six talks in a session virtually guarantees no one will see every talk in the session.”

“PLDI was established as a strong brand because it has single track, Physical meeting of PC, no submission from PC members and enough time for presentations and questions. Shorter talks, multiple tracks, PC member submission, etc, reduce, over time the value of the PLDI brand.”

“Keep talk length at 20 minutes, but allow presenters to add 5-10 minutes (if they deem it critical to their talk).”

“Too many papers.”

“Accepting 44 papers and having 15-minute talks was a bold move, and I applaud it. I hope next time for a longer conference and longer presentations. Defend breaks! They are invaluable. If the number of high-quality papers remains so high, it is better to do without invited speakers. Both breaks and longer talks are more important than invited speakers. 15 minute talks are much better.”

“The facilities/hotel were sub par, the rooms were small, the conference internet was very poor, the hotel services were bad.”

“Conference room too cold.”

“Would prefer fewer, longer, better talks – having a short talk session one day would be fine to key the volume up.”

“Please add the excursion back.”

**Re: Question 4 – The talks were well presented
“Some were a little fast paced.”**

**Re: Question 8 – I prefer the length of presentations (i.e., talks) be
“Add five minutes for questions.”
“With time for questions! If you accept so many papers.”**

**Re: Question 9 – Currently PLDI is a 2 ½ day conference. The length of PLDI should be
“Depends on east/west time zone.”
“Depends on whether evening flights were available.”**

**Re: Question 11 – PLDI should consider using dual tracks to accommodate more papers
“Dual Tracks = Yes, More Papers = NO, Longer Presentations = Yes**

**Re: Question 14 – In addition to the 10-year retrospective award, PLDI should have a best paper award
“Fast Journal Elevation (ACM!)”**

Re: Question 15 – The meals and break food were satisfactory
“Bad Food, Horrible!”
“Breakfast was great! Lunch was uniformly awful.”
“Need food during morning breaks.”

Re: Question 16 – My hotel room was satisfactory
“I didn’t stay @ the T & C because I don’t like it.”
“No desk in the room.”

Re: Question 17 – The hotel service and amenities (e.g., internet access, room service, concierge service, etc) was satisfactory
“Internet is terrible.”
“Internet access flakey”
“Everything was ok except for internet access.”
“N/A stayed elsewhere because the Town & Country stinks.”
“Stayed in a nearby cheaper hotel.”
“Too little bandwidth for in room internet.”

Re: Question 19 – PLDI 2007 allowed authors to write rebuttals to reviews. I think that the author rebuttal is:
“If forwarded to reviewers, which was not the case, and reviews changed accordingly.”

Re: Question 20 – PLDI 2007 used double-blind reviewing (reviewers did not know author identity before the PC meeting). I think double-blind reviewing is:
“Useful, if correctly managed.”

Re: Question 22 – With the possible exception of my own submission(s), the committee did
“Would need to know what was rejected.”
“Too many papers related to US. Not claiming unfairness, this may be just a bias.”