[Issue #19](#) (open): [DECISION] Gatherplots 13-May-2024

[@codementum](#) on
Jun 14, 2024 00:27:

[opened]

[@codementum](#) on
Jun 14, 2024 00:27:

Conflicts of interest

- ☑ I declare that I have no known conflicts of interest with the authors.

Reviewed version

2e0cbdc49168904b3b8149690944a117ddacd174

Reviews summarized

- R1 [#7](#)
- R2 [#15](#)
- R3 [#16](#)
- Accessibility [#6](#)

(Note: these are threads with second round reviews & author responses.)

Meta-Review

Reviewers made several suggestions in first and second round reviews, which the authors have now addressed.

Importantly, edits focus on requests for minor revisions ([#15](#) and [#16](#), @facet-fan and @jov-anonymous-reviewer-AAAA + @jov-anonymous-reviewer-AAAA-proxy, and partially addressing major revisions ([#7](#) @joviewer-xyz).

Given the nature of the revisions requested, and having now reviewed the author's edits, I believe the paper is ready to move to the final phase, and I will endorse it's publication.

Next steps: - The paper needs a bit of copy editing: - I found a few typos: "taks" and "absolutel". - The citations starting with DBLP seem to break links somehow, e.g. the new Correll citations appear broken. Perhaps it is the colon in the citation key?

- As it stands, the paper is on track to be published with 3 endorsements and 1 possible endorsement / unendorsement. These decisions will be included in the published paper, along with links to the review threads.
  - Reviewer (issue [#7](#), @joviewer-xyz) will have to decide if they want to endorse, endorse with reservations, or unendorse.
  - If the reviewer does not pick an unqualified "endorse", the authors will have to decide if they want to publish at this time, or make additional changes to the paper.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge that I agree with the outstanding request (i.e., the simulation/user study requested in [#7](#)). That said, I also believe the paper in it's current form makes worthwhile contributions that others can learn and build from.

Decision

Endorse: I am willing to endorse this paper, with at most minor copyediting.

Next steps:

- The paper needs a bit of copy editing:

  - I found a few typos: "taks" and "absolutel".

Revision: This has been fixed.

- The citations starting with DBLP seem to break links somehow, e.g. the new Correll citations appear broken. Perhaps it is the colon in the citation key?

I had simply forgotten to commit the changes to the .bib. This has now been addressed.

- As it stands, the paper is on track to be published with 3 endorsements and 1 possible endorsement / undendorsement. These decisions will be included in the published paper, along with links to the review threads.

  - Reviewer (issue [REVIEW] Gatherplot review #7, @joviewer-xyz) will have to decide if they want to endorse, endorse with reservations, or unendorse.
  - If the reviewer does not pick an unqualified "endorse", the authors will have to decide if they want to publish at this time, or make additional changes to the paper.

Thank you; we will await @joviewer-xyz's decision.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge that I agree with the outstanding request (i.e., the simulation/user study requested in #7). That said, I also believe the paper in it's current form makes worthwhile contributions that others can learn and build from.

Thank you. I took @joviewer-xyz's comment to mean that *either* a simulation study *or* applying the definitions in a computational manner would be sufficient to address this point. I will await the reviewer's word on this matter.

Decision

Endorse: I am willing to endorse this paper, with at most minor copyediting.

@joviewer-xyz on
Jun 31, 2024 17:58:

Thanks @nickelm for the continued careful effort to improve the paper. The added and modified sections are welcome changes that do serve to address some of my criticisms and requests.

Following @codementum 's question: i would have strongly preferred there to be a simulation study (which was an aspect of my requested changes)---or another user study---to address some of the open questions. However, given the repeated emphasis that no substantial changes can be added to the work (cf the declined request for a slider on a particular figure) it seems like unlikely that any additional requests, such as the aforementioned simulation study, will be heeded.

So, with that in mind I offer an "endorse with reservations" judgement. In my view, this work could be stronger if additional work was done to improve it, but it is of

a borderline-acceptable quality in its current state. There is value in the work (for instance the comparison of jitter with a bespoke method is a nice standalone result), and publishing the work with its current content would support that value (although many questions remain open).

@codementum on Jul 01, 2024 13:20:

Thanks for chiming in @joviewer-xyz!

@nickelm The process supports two options now: 1) additional revisions to potentially get to an "unqualified endorsement", or 2) publish in the current state.

If the latter (publish) option is chosen, next steps would be minor edits and review to get to a "published" state. If the former option is chosen, it is simply another round of revisions + engagement with reviewer(s).

@nickelm on Jul 01, 2024 21:14:

Thank you to both @joviewer-xyz and @codementum.

I'll choose publishing in the current state. I stand ready to address minor revisions and make whatever changes are needed to publish the paper.

@mjskay on Jul 02, 2024 00:00:

Great, thanks all!

@codementum are there any outstanding content-related minor revisions? If we can get those squared away then I will put on my "experimental track Tech Chair" hat and do a pass for any last formatting issues, and figure out how we want to format things like endorsements.

@codementum on Jul 02, 2024 12:18:

@mjskay No additional minor revisions that I'm aware of. Checked all reviews again and they seem to be covered.