

Practices of PLDI

Hans Boehm, Jack Davidson, Alastair F. Donaldson, Kathleen Fisher, Cormac Flanagan, Jeffrey S. Foster, Jeremy Gibbons, Mary Hall, Graham Hutton, David Padua, Frank Tip, Jan Vitek, Philip Wadler, Keshav Pingali, Michael O'Boyle, Steve Blackburn, Emery Berger

Version 8 - November 2024

Goal	2
Definitions	3
Topics	3
Managing Change	3
Communication	3
Surveys	3
Conference Organization	3
Steering Committee Composition	3
Prescriptions	4
Selection of Organizing Committee	4
Prescriptions	4
Suggestions	4
Conference Venue	4
Prescriptions	4
Suggestions	4
Review Committee Composition	4
Prescriptions	4
Timeline	6
Prescriptions	6
Paper Format Requirements	6
Paper Format and Length	6
Prescription	6
Citation Style	7
Review Process	7
Assignment of Reviews	7
Author Anonymity	7
Prescriptions	7
Reviewer Anonymity	8
Guardians	8

Two Rounds of Reviewing	8
Number of Reviews	9
Conflicts of Interest	9
Prescriptions	9
Suggestions	9
Expert and External Reviews	10
Suggestions	10
Submission of Supplementary Material	10
Evaluation Criteria and Acceptance Ratio	10
Suggestions	11
RC Submissions	11
Author Response	11
Decision Rationale	12
Distinguished Papers	12
RC Member Responsibilities	12
RC Management	13
RC Meeting	14
One-minute madness	15
Naming of Proceedings	15
Artifact Evaluation Process	15
TOPLAS referrals	16
SIGPLAN track	16
Errata	16
Academic Disputes	16

Goal

Our goal is to create a contract between PLDI organizers, the PACMPL journal, and the broader PLDI community that defines essential organizational and reviewing policies. We wish to establish clear expectations for authors while allowing plenty of leeway for organizers to innovate. We anticipate that the contract will change over time, but when it does, we'll inform the community and provide a justification for the change.

The remainder of this document is organized topically. Each topic has two subsections: *Prescriptions* and *Suggestions*. *Prescriptions* are firm policies; we expect that the organizers for each incarnation of PLDI will adhere to the policies. In cases where the organizers feel an exception or change is warranted, they must first consult with the SC. *Suggestions* are best practices that we expect organizers to strongly consider.

Definitions

AE: Associate Editor (formally referred to as Program Committee Chair)

ARC: Additional Review Committee

CFP: Call for papers

COI: Conflict of interest

DBR: Double-blind reviewing

EC: SIGPLAN Executive Committee

GC: General Chair

OC: Organizing Committee

PACMPL: The Proceedings of the ACM Programming Languages journal

RC: Review Committee (formally referred to as Program Committee)

SC: Steering Committee

SIGPLAN: ACM Special Interest Group on Programming Languages

SIGPLAN VC: SIGPLAN Executive Committee Vice Chair

Topics

Managing Change

This topic addresses the meta-policy of how the SC manages changes in policy.

Communication

Prescriptions

Pending changes should be clearly communicated to the community in advance. Input from the community about all significant changes in policy should be sought at the open meeting at the previous conference (i.e., five months before the submission deadline) and/or, as appropriate, via electronic means.

Surveys

Suggestions

Surveys of authors, reviewers and attendees are a good mechanism for gathering community feedback. Careful alignment of survey questions from year to year and with those from other SIGPLAN conferences may allow meaningful comparisons to be drawn longitudinally and among the conferences.

Conference Organization

Steering Committee Composition

Prescriptions

The SC for the period from PLDI X to PLDI $X+1$ consists of:

- The current SC chair
- The current SIGPLAN chair and vice-chair
- The GC and AE for PLDI $X-2$, $X-1$, and X
- The outgoing SC chair, for one year past the end of his or her term as Chair.
- Up to three "members at large", serving three year terms. Each year, one member at large will be replaced with a new member, selected by the Steering Committee by consensus with no explicit nays.

In addition to the above formal members, the GC and AE for future PLDIs are typically invited to participate in most SC discussions. The SC Chair is elected by the SC from among the members of the committee to serve a three-year term. The outgoing chair serves an additional year on the committee past his or her term as chair to provide institutional memory. The constitution of the SC changes every year on July 1.

Selection of Organizing Committee

Prescriptions

The GC and AE for year $X+3$ are selected by the SC for year X to $X+1$, subject to the approval of the EC. The GC and AE select other members of the OC.

Suggestions

To provide continuity, each OC position (Student Research Competition, Sponsorship, Workshops and Tutorials, etc.) is encouraged to be co-chaired, with co-chairs holding staggered two year terms, in which each year only one of the co-chairs is replaced. OC members can suggest their own successors, in consultation with the SC. The GC may appoint other members of the OC.

Conference Venue

Prescriptions

The conference venue is chosen by the GC, in consultation with the SC. We strive to identify venues that reflect the diversity of the community.

Suggestions

In recent years, PLDI has rotated between the East Coast of North America, the West Coast of North America, and Europe. PLDI 2012 in China went well, PLDI 2025 will take place in Korea, and PLDI may rotate to other locations in Asia in the future. Some flexibility in location choice is desirable, since we may not get the most attractive hotel bid in our ideal city.

Review Committee Composition

Prescriptions

The RC is selected by the AE in consultation with the GC and the SC. The composition of the RC is subject to approval by the SIGPLAN VC.

Topical, personal, and institutional diversity is critical to the long term vitality of PLDI. In general, PLDI adheres to the SIGPLAN Diversity Policy. Some particulars:

- The group consisting of the RC plus the GC and AE should have no more than 10% of its members from any single institution, except in cases where the AE makes a compelling case to the SC and EC that there is a reason to deviate (e.g., to ensure an adequate coverage of expertise). The definition of "institution" has been the topic of much debate. When in doubt, use the broadest definition for which conflicts can reasonably be said to exist (e.g., Microsoft Research Redmond and Microsoft Research Bangalore are said to be the same institution because publishing success at the former boosts the reputation of the latter).
- PLDI strives to ensure decisions reflect the broad diversity of the community. Normally, RC members should not serve on the RC more often than every three years. An exception may be made to enable a small overlap (<10%) from year to year to provide continuity. No one should serve on the RC for more than two years in a row.
- The RC should aim to achieve a roughly uniform distribution of seniority (from junior to senior).
- The AE should strive to avoid the appearance of favoring current and former students, postdocs, colleagues, or collaborators for membership on the RC or ARC.
- The same diversity criteria listed above should apply to the ARC, scaled to the size of the ARC.

Suggestions

- The AE should consider appointing a number of Area Chairs to help manage the review process.
- The AE of year X should consider appointing the upcoming AE of year X+1 as an Area Chair for year X, to help to prepare them for managing the whole review process. To reduce AE workload, the AE of year X+1 may be assigned a smaller number of papers to manage in their year X Area Chair role compared with other Area Chairs.
- The AE should strive to avoid selecting RC members that collaborate regularly with each other or with the AE, or RC members from the same institution in the exact same area.
- AEs are encouraged to include deserving young researchers who have not yet had the opportunity to serve on a program or review committee. The [PC-Miner tool](#) has been used to identify such researchers.
- AEs are encouraged to consider the *submission* profile of previous years when assessing the coverage and diversity of their committees. Focusing only on the *accepted* publication profile of previous years may skew the PLDI profile.
- In recent years the RC has been large enough that each RC member has usually been assigned between 9-12 papers to review.

Timeline

Prescriptions

- Deadlines should be advertised as a fixed date anywhere on earth (AOE).
- Authors should receive decisions on whether their submissions are rejected or invited to be resubmitted for a second round of reviewing in under three months.

Suggestions

- June, X-24 months: GC selection
- October, X-20 months: AE selection
- January, X-17 months: Submit candidate RC and ARC to SIGPLAN VC and PLDI SC
- March, X-15 months: Finalize RC, including running the list of RC members through the ACM's Violations Database
- June, X-12 months: Publish RC and CFP
- November, X-7 months: Submission deadline
- February, X-4 months: Round 1 Author Response Period
- February, X-4 months: Round 1 Author notification
- March, X-3 months: Round 2 submission deadline
- March / April, X-2.5 months: Round 2 Author notification
- April, X-2 months: Camera ready deadline

In the past it has been customary to identify an *abstract deadline* one week ahead of the paper deadline. The abstract deadline has been deprecated as it does not assist authors or AE.

The AE is encouraged to synchronize, to the extent it is possible, submission and notification deadlines with related conferences (e.g. ASPLOS).

Late submissions and requests for changes are typically denied; exceptions can be made in special cases in consultation with the SC Chair.

Paper Format Requirements

Paper Format and Length

Prescription

Papers should be formatted according to [the PACMPL style](#), and be no more than 20 pages long, *exclusive* of the bibliography. The bibliography is excluded from the page count to encourage good citation practices and discourage illegible bibliographies.

Suggestion

The AE can use the format checker, [banal](#), that comes with HotCRP to check for formatting compliance. This tool also allows authors to check compliance before the deadline.

Citation Style

Prescription

Papers should follow the [citation style required by PACMPL](#).

Review Process

Assignment of Reviews

Suggestions

- The bidding process should ensure that *preference* and *expertise* are not conflated; when they are, some of the most expert reviewers are likely to be missed.
- AEs are encouraged to enlist the help of a small number of trusted people with expertise across SIGPLAN during the review assignment process. Suitable people may include the GC, past AEs of related conferences, or experts within major sub-fields.
- Suggestions for reviewers should be solicited from each paper's guardian.

Author Anonymity

Prescriptions

PLDI is committed to use double-blind reviewing. The primary goal of DBR is to *help RC members review papers with minimal bias*. The process should be such that authors are able to withhold their identity, and reviewers are able to avoid learning their identity:

1. Submissions should not have author names and references to previous work must be in the third person.
2. Authors are not required to "hide" their submissions: they can put them on web pages and give talks about them.
3. Reviewers should notify the AE if anonymity is an obstacle to sound and objective reviewing of a paper.
4. The identities of authors of papers accepted during Round 1 should only be revealed to the RC once Round 1 acceptance notifications have been sent. The identities of authors of papers rejected during Round 1 should not be revealed to the RC.

Given the use of DBR, the AE must vet any external reviewers suggested by an RC member.

Suggestions

Provision (2) above is intended to prevent DBR from inhibiting normal dissemination of scientific ideas. Authors should not, however, take it as a license to explicitly lobby the RC or likely reviewers on behalf of their work. While we will not attempt to codify or police such behavior, AEs may wish to remind authors of their obligation to live up to the spirit as well as the letter of DBR.

Reviewer Anonymity

Some reviewers have argued that by signing their reviews they increase transparency. Jean Camp says: *'[Signing reviews] has been perceived as bullying by the recipients, "Disagree if you are (wo)man enough." It shuts down discourse rather than opening it. It is placed in a moment of extreme power difference, of researcher and reviewer, with no chance of the reviewed of changing the outcome.'* The author response mechanism and the fact that reviewers' identities are transparent to other committee members provide a sufficient accountability mechanism.

Prescription

Reviews should not be signed. The AE should be sure to make reviewers aware of this policy.

Guardians

A guardian is an RC member assigned responsibility for ensuring that a paper is carefully and fairly assessed. Concretely, a guardian's role may include:

- Assisting the AE in identifying gaps in reviewer expertise.
- Ensuring that all reviews are of an appropriate standard.
- Facilitating online discussions.
- Writing the author-visible summary of the decision rationale.

Suggestions

- The AE assigns a guardian to each submission, drawn from the RC, and each RC member should be assigned roughly the same number of papers.
- Guardians should be informed of their duties at the time that they are invited to the RC.

Two Rounds of Reviewing

A *two-round review process* is necessary a) to meet the requirements of PACMPL, b) to avoid outstanding work being rejected on the basis of a problem that, though important, can easily be fixed, and c) to improve the quality of all accepted papers.

Prescriptions

- PLDI papers will be selected via two rounds of reviewing.
- At the end of the first round, authors will be given several days to compose a written response to the reviews, e.g. to correct errors and clarify technical concerns. Based on the reviews, responses and RC discussion, the RC will conditionally accept a subset of the submissions and all other submissions will be rejected.
- In the second round, authors of conditionally-accepted papers will be given an opportunity to improve specific aspects of the research and the paper, as identified by the reviewers. Authors will have sufficient time to perform the required revisions and re-submit the paper. The same reviewers as in the first round will then assess how the revision requests have

been acted upon by the authors. Revisions that fail to adequately address the reviewers' original concerns will result in rejection.

Number of Reviews

Prescriptions

- Each submitted paper should receive at least three reviews in total (with the exception of papers that are desk-rejected)

Conflicts of Interest

Prescriptions

Authors and RC members must adhere to SIGPLAN's [conflict of interest policy](#). In cases where the AE has a conflict with an author, the chair must designate a non-conflicted senior RC member to manage the review process and make the final acceptance determination.

Suggestions

If the AE has appointed Area Chairs, the Area Chairs would typically manage the review process for papers with which the AE has a conflict.

Conflicts of interest can be tricky to manage in the presence of DBR. The following policy is adapted from Michael Hicks' [FAQ](#).

Using DBR does not change the principle that reviewers should not review papers with which they have a conflict of interest, even if they do not immediately know who the authors are. Quoting (with slight alteration) from the [ACM SIGPLAN review policies document](#):

A conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which the reviewer can be viewed as being able to benefit personally in the process of reviewing a paper. For example, if a reviewer is considering a paper written by a member of his own group, a current student, his advisor, or a group that he is seen as being in close competition with, then the outcome of the review process can have direct benefit to the reviewer's own status. Conflicts of interest may also exist between family members, or if people have a non-trivial financial interest in each other's work. If a conflict of interest exists, the potential reviewer should decline to review the paper.

In previous years, PLDI relied on authors to indicate whether they had conflicts of interest with RC/ARC members. However, experience has shown that this practice is prone to abuse and that author-supplied conflict information cannot be relied upon. As a result, it is our recommendation that AEs do not rely on authors to declare conflicts, but instead to rely only on RC/ARC members to declare conflicts of interest with people and institutions. While this potentially provides RC members some clues about author identity, this can be mitigated by augmenting the list of authors with the names of authors of papers at previous instances of PLDI when conflicts are declared.

Expert and External Reviews

PLDI is committed to identifying expert reviewers for every submission, insofar as possible. By "expert," we mean a reviewer who is very well versed and current in related work in the field. Authors gain confidence in the outcome of review decisions when expert reviewers are involved. That said, we believe that well-informed, but non-expert reviews also play a significant role in acceptance decisions: they represent the majority of the future readership of a paper, and involving them mitigates against topical balkanization.

Prescriptions

The AE should strive to identify at least two (RC or external) expert reviewers for each paper that the AE deems to be a serious contender for acceptance, but reserve the right not to do so in rare cases where a sufficient number of willing external reviewers can't be identified. The chair should also strive to identify at least one (RC or external) informed non-expert reviewer.

External reviewers will be encouraged to participate in online discussion of the papers they've been assigned; however, they should not see unrelated online RC discussions.

The AE may designate and announce an Additional Review Committee (ARC) in the CFP.

Suggestions

The AE should exercise some judgment in assessing expertise ratings. Some RC members consider themselves experts on most topics, while other, more modest, RC members almost never declare themselves an expert. In the end, the AE should use his/her judgment in deciding whether the expertise on a given paper is sufficient.

Submission of Supplementary Material

Prescriptions

Authors will be allowed to submit supplementary material (proofs, software, datasets, etc.) at the time of submission. The RC is allowed, but not required, to consult this material.

Two forms of supplementary material may be submitted: anonymized material, made available to reviewers along with the submission, and non-anonymized material, which will only be made available to reviewers (a) after they have submitted their initial reviews and (b) when the program chair decides that it is absolutely necessary to violate double-blind; this will be done on a case-by-case basis. Both are useful in different circumstances: the former is appropriate for materials (e.g. proofs, technical appendices) that are easy to anonymize and may aid expert reviewers in assessing the technical correctness of a paper, whereas the latter is appropriate for materials (e.g. software, datasets) that are difficult to anonymize.

Evaluation Criteria and Acceptance Ratio

Prescriptions

We strive to accept all high-quality submissions with no numerical limit on acceptable papers.

Suggestions

- The RC should focus its deliberations on:
 - whether there is a genuine research contribution which may include a new insightful evaluation of previous work
 - whether the approach is fundamentally sound
 - whether the community will benefit from reading the paper
 - whether the paper (and supporting material) contain sufficient information for others to reproduce and build on the results
- The committee should lean toward accepting papers that are controversial, that is, ones that, after discussion, still have both a strong advocate and a strong detractor.
- The committee should lean toward accepting papers that explicate their results clearly.
- The committee should lean toward accepting papers that are accompanied by key supplementary material (especially code, data & proofs) over papers that are not (but logically could be).

RC Submissions

RC submissions can be problematic to manage, but we believe that on balance, the benefits of allowing RC submissions exceed the costs.

Prescriptions

PLDI will allow RC submissions, but disallow submissions by the GC and AE.

In line with [SIGPLAN guidelines](#), because PLDI uses full double blind reviewing and has a RC with at least fifty members, RC submissions do not need to be held to a higher standard than other papers.

Acceptance decisions for RC papers will be announced at the same time as other author decisions are announced.

The policy on RC submission must be clearly explained to candidate RC members when their participation on the RC is solicited.

Author Response

Prescriptions

PLDI will allow author review responses. Authors will be allowed to read all reviews that are available at the time of the author response period. The AE will make every effort to complete *all* initial reviews before the author-response period. Late initial reviews are unacceptable. Additional reviews may be solicited after the author response period and it may not be possible for the authors to see these reviews before final decisions are made by the RC. Authors must be allowed at least four days to respond. To ensure fairness among authors, the AE should be very clear about what the expectations and obligations of the reviewers and authors are with respect to the author response.

Suggestions

- Many authors like seeing the scores on the reviews at author response time, so consider making the scores available as well as the reviews.
- Authors should be strongly encouraged to be brief.
- RC chairs may choose to state that the RC is not obliged to read or respond to responses beyond a certain designated length.
- The AE may choose to allow authors to provide feedback on review quality, e.g., via a simple rating scale, in addition to rebutting the content of the review.
- AEs are encouraged to offer authors a right of reply to any substantive critique of the submission. This includes reviews submitted after the author response period and any *substantial* new criticism raised during reviewer discussion .

Decision Rationale

Prescription

AEs are encouraged to ensure that author-visible decision rationales are made available for all papers. The task could be assigned to the paper's guardian. The purpose of the rationale is to provide the authors with a concise, coherent summary of the committee's position; something that is frequently not clear from the sum of the individual reviews.

For accepted papers, the rationale will include any changes requested by the reviewers.

Distinguished Papers

Prescription

Up to 10% of the accepted papers may be designated for ACM SIGPLAN Distinguished Paper Awards.

Suggestions

- Nominations may be solicited from the RC and ARC, and will also include the top 10% papers in terms of numeric scores. RC/ARC members should not nominate papers by authors they are conflicted with.
- RC papers may be nominated.
- The RC/ARC (excluding the authors of any nominated papers) will vote on this set of nominated papers. Each RC member may cast as many votes as the target number of Distinguished Papers. The usual conflict-of-interest rules will apply (e.g., RC/ARC members cannot vote on papers with which they have a conflict of interest).
- The AE and GC decide which papers will receive the award. While the number of votes received by nominated papers is an important factor, the AE and GC may exercise their judgment in making their decision.

RC Member Responsibilities

Prescriptions

RC members must commit to reading all of their assigned papers and writing their own reviews. RC members may also suggest additional reviewers, but they should not subcontract reading or review writing duties to others. The AE must always be consulted before additional reviewers are contacted to avoid conflicts and to ensure topical balance.

RC members must commit to fully participating in the RC decision making process. An individual who cannot do so should decline the invitation.

RC members should be directed to the [SIGPLAN Republication Policy](#). If a related version of the paper appeared in a workshop, take into account whether its call for papers stated that publication in the workshop is not intended to preclude later publication.

RC Management

Prescriptions

PLDI in-person RC meetings are no longer required starting with PLDI 2021. In 2024 the PLDI SC surveyed the community, and the majority of respondents were in favor of sticking to the prescription that in-person RC meetings should not be required.

RC members are allowed to participate in the discussion (both online and in-person) of papers that they didn't review, and with which they have no conflicts.

If there is an RC meeting, it should be preceded by an extensive online discussion period. The online discussion period should be a minimum of one week, but two (or more) is strongly preferred. During the discussion period, the RC will be allowed to see all papers for which they have no conflicts, and participate in the discussion. Online discussion must be actively facilitated by the AE, and paper guardians.

The AE will strive to ensure, prior to the RC meeting, that every *competitive* paper has at least

- two RC reviews
- at least one, and preferably two expert reviews

RC papers may be reviewed by both RC and ARC members.

Keeping the same reviewing form has benefits for authors and reviewers as they can more easily calibrate and interpret scores if the ratings are well understood. Nierstrasz' Identify the Champion scoring process has stood the test of time. The review form shall have (at least) the following fields:

- Paper score:
 - A: Good paper. I will champion it.
 - B: OK paper, but I will not champion it.
 - C: Weak paper, though I will not fight strongly against it.
 - D: Serious problems. I will argue to reject this paper.
- Reviewer expertise:

X: I am an expert in the subject area of this paper.

Y: I am knowledgeable in the area, though not an expert.

Z: I am not an expert. My evaluation is that of an informed outsider.

- Paper summary (reviewer's synopsis provides a useful sanity check)
- Points in favor (encourage positive reviewing)
- Points against (be clear about principal objections)
- Detailed comments for authors (body of review)

Suggestions

- The AE should acquaint themselves ahead of time with the conference management system (HotCRP), and the facilities it offers. Configuring a HotCRP instance from the AE side is nontrivial, therefore the AE for year X having a session with the AE of year X-1 to look over their settings is a good idea.
- RC members should be strongly encouraged to submit reviews as they are completed; this makes it easier for the AE to monitor progress and identify problems early.
- The AE may wish to identify major reviewer disagreements and papers without sufficient expertise and seek second opinions where necessary to help resolve the disagreements.
- We recommend that the AE allow all reviewers to see decisions for the papers they have reviewed before decisions are publicly announced.
- Obtaining multiple expert RC reviews per paper can be hard because some reviewers are conservative about labeling themselves as experts. Additionally, some reviewers are overly willing to label themselves as experts. One approach that AEs have found useful is to get each group of reviewers to assess whether they are collectively able to competently evaluate a submission.

RC Meeting

Note that an RC meeting is not required. The following prescription and suggestions are only relevant if the AE chooses to hold an RC meeting.

Prescriptions

The AE will designate one or more "COI-AEs" who will handle papers the AE is conflicted with.

Suggestions

- If the AE has appointed Area Chairs, they may play the "COI-AE" roles. The GC may also help with this role.
- Experience has shown that a two day RC meeting provides adequate time for deliberation while avoiding RC burnout.
- The AE is encouraged to have one or two dedicated assistants to deal with timekeeping and bookkeeping in order to allow the AE to focus entirely on the discussion rather than logistical concerns. A senior non-RC member such as the GC or next AE can fulfill this role.

- Instead of considering the papers in order from highest-ranked to lowest, consider the papers in a quasi-random order (see article by Kathleen Fisher in SIGPLAN Notices, 46(4):17, April 2011).
- If the most positive reviewer for a paper is external, the chair may wish to ensure that the paper is discussed on day one of the RC meeting and the outcome summarized by the AE so that the external reviewer can provide additional feedback prior to a final decision.
- The AE is encouraged to use a multi-round discussion process for papers where an initial consensus is not apparent. Tying up the entire RC on account of a disagreement between two or three reviewers is poor use of time. Scheduled breaks can be very effective in managing such disputes whilst keeping the RC focussed and engaged.
- The AE is encouraged to distinguish between contentious and marginal papers and table all marginal papers until the end of the meeting to allow them to be systematically considered in the context of the emergent acceptance standard.

One-minute madness

Suggestions

Each day of the conference, the first session of the day should be a plenary, typically including an invited talk, and also including "one-minute madness", sixty-second summaries from each speaker scheduled for that day. The goal is to help attendees decide which session to attend, and to provide a view of PLDI that can be attended by all in spite of parallel sessions. Attention will be required to ensure smooth progression of speakers, including pre-loading all slides on a single machine; organizers may wish to schedule a rehearsal.

Recommendations

You may wish to use three student volunteers: one running the laptop, one as compere on-stage with the stopwatch, one off-stage marshaling the queue.

Naming of Proceedings

Prescription

The proceedings will form an issue of PACMPL, and will be named Vol X (PLDI), where X is the volume number corresponding to the year in which the conference takes place.

Artifact Evaluation Process

Prescription

PLDI is committed to having an Artifact Evaluation Committee (AEC). The AEC is run by a separate chair who selects AEC members, typically advanced graduate students and postdoctoral researchers. The AEC is provided with accepted papers and their reviews. The outcome of the AEC is a seal to indicate that a paper had an artifact that met or exceeded the expectation set in the body of the paper. The seal is printed with the paper and displayed on the conference web site. The AEC may choose to award a prize for the best artifact.

TOPLAS referrals

Prescription

The TOPLAS Editor in Chief may forward papers accepted at TOPLAS before the Round 2 notification date. These papers must be original contributions, and not extended versions of previous conference papers.

The AE will review the papers and decide whether they are topically of relevance to PLDI, if so, the papers will be presented during the conference.

SIGPLAN track

Suggestion

Recent editions of PLDI have featured a SIGPLAN track, allowing for the presentation of papers that recently appeared in the proceedings of other SIGPLAN conferences, but which were not presented at said conferences (e.g. due to visa problems). GCs and AEs should consider incorporating a SIGPLAN track into their edition of PLDI, if time and space constraints allow.

Errata

The PLDI community values the integrity of its published record. When the published work is subsequently found to be incorrect or misleading, the PLDI culture should be that authors correct the record, following the ACM's policy for updating published papers.

Recommendation

Authors are encouraged to update the DL copy of the pdf of their paper with errata when a significant correction to the work needs to be made. The update should comply with the ACM policy for updates.

Academic Disputes

Occasionally, a *third party* will bring to light information that throws into doubt the validity of the core of a published paper. Ideally, the authors of the affected paper will be approached by the complainant/s and will address the concerns through an erratum, following the procedure above. In the case where this does not occur, the following process should be applied.

Prescription

The following process should be applied to any third party bringing to light information that seriously threatens the validity of a published PLDI paper that has not been addressed by the authors through an erratum:

1. The complainant/s should present their concern to the AE of the proceedings in which the affected paper appears. The complaint will be limited to a **single page of plain text** (about 500 words, with references as necessary), and must be made within **one year** of the publication of the affected paper.

2. The AE may dismiss the complaint if they deem it to be not serious enough to warrant an erratum (see Errata, above).
3. The AE will promptly forward the complaint to the affected authors and give the authors **one month** in which to respond.
4. The authors may respond to the complaint by providing an erratum (above) *or* a rebuttal limited to a **single page of plain text** (about 500 words).
5. In the *case that the authors provide an erratum*, the AE will communicate the erratum to the complainant/s and give them **one month** in which to reconsider their complaint, at which point they may withdraw their complaint or return to step 1 with a complaint revised in light of the new erratum.
6. In the *case that the authors do not provide errata*, the process terminates.

At the completion of the process, the AE will ensure that: a) any errata generated by the process are installed in the ACM DL (see Errata, above) and b) if not dismissed in step 2, the one-page complaint and the authors' one-page response are included in the comments section of the paper's DL entry, with a covering note from the AE. The AE may 'shepherd' either of the one-page documents if necessary to keep the discourse reasonable and professional.

Either party, if unsatisfied by the adjudication of the AE, may take the matter to the PLDI SC.