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MAILING DATES, 2008
Submission data

Papers submitted, January to December 2008: 984
Papers submitted, January to December 2007: 940
Special issue, scheduled December 2009

GUEST EiC: Olgica Milenkovic

40 pre-submissions

3–4 invited tutorial/state-of-the-art
Pareja vs. Manuscript Central

Ad hoc committee appointed to recommend changes to Pareja:

- Alex Grant
- Aria Nosratinia
- Giorgio Taricco
- Adriaan J. van Wijngaarden
Sub-to-Pub data (RIGGED!)

(report generated for journal content posted to IEEE Xplore in Q3 2008---it refers to all the articles posted in that quarter)

--- Weeks submitted to first revision (Columns A for mean & G for median)
--- Weeks submitted to last revision (Columns B & H)
--- Weeks submitted to accepted (Columns C & I)
--- Weeks submitted to final manuscript received (Columns D & J)
--- Weeks accepted to final manuscript received (Columns E & K)
--- Weeks submitted to online post (Columns F & L)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-IT</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-SP</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ave.</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-to-Pub data (January 2009)

AVERAGE = 97.2
MEDIAN = 73.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>1st Q1</th>
<th>2nd Q1</th>
<th>3rd Q1</th>
<th>4th Q1</th>
<th>5th Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CODTEC</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODTHE</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUN</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMNET</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRYPTO</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETEST</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATREC</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANIT</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQUEN</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHANTH</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUCOD</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGPRO</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
can subscribers of the e-version of the T-ITs receive each month the Table of Contents of the issue?

**IEEE response:**
- Ability to send TOC alerts to anyone who signs up for them.
- There are two ways to set up TOC alerts.
- Alerts come whenever a new issue is posted to IEEE Xplore.
DECREASING SUB-TO-PUB TIME
### sub-to-pub time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation</th>
<th>who</th>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assign to AE</td>
<td>EiC</td>
<td>1—2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assign to reviewers</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>&lt; 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write reviews</td>
<td>REV</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make preliminary decision</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>&lt; 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revise text</td>
<td>author</td>
<td>&lt; 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make final decision</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>&lt; 1 month?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit final text</td>
<td>author</td>
<td>&lt; 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send to publication editor</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>&lt; 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send to production</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>every month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td>IEEE staff, EiC</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decrease AE load

- Increasing AE number may generate problems of homogeneity
- Remove the praxis of a single term for AEs?
- Remove BoG rubber stamp for appointment of AEs?
set stringent deadlines

- For reviews (depending on manuscript’s weight)
- For preliminary paper decisions
- For submission of revised version
introduce positive/negative enforcement policy for authors (see Anant’s paper)

- Classify reviewers (good/bad)
- Assign papers from good authors to good reviewers and vcv

**Upsides:**

- Enforce “good citizenship”

**Downsides:**

- If policy is applied mechanically, students of “bad” professors might be penalized
• start campaign for more responsible reviewers (and AEs)

- Positive reinforcement (best-reviewer award) has failed
- Generate effective “how-to” document for training editors and guiding reviewers [IN PREPARATION]
- Promote editorials in key publications, reminding members of our shared responsibility to do this job well.
new reviewing procedures

- Rekindle “kibitz” reviewing (*)
- Have more student reviews
- Set up “SWAT” team (selected old AEs?)
- Introduce “diamond lane” for short papers
  (quick review, accept/reject decision only)

(*) kib·it·z (kbts) intr.v. kib·itz·ed, kib·itz·ing, kib·itz·es

  Informal 1. To look on and offer unwanted, usually meddlesome advice to others
  [Yiddish kibitsen, from German kiebitzen, from Kiebitz, pewit, from Middle
  High German gibitz, pewit, of imitative origin.]