




26th International Conference on
Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems

MODELS 23

1-6 October 2023
Västerås, Sweden

Sun 1 - Fri 6 October 2023 Västerås, Sweden



City skyline

Photo by Avig Kazanjian



MODELS 2023 PB Meeting

16 June 2023

Pre-Meeting Information

- Submissions Status
- Acceptance Rates
- Evaluation Criteria
- Discussion Process
- After the PB Meeting

Submissions Status

Submission Discussion Categories

Category	Consensus	Description
Clear accepts	yes	all positive, very high scores
Clear rejects	yes	all negative, very low scores
Approve	yes	decision should be a formality
Short discussion	yes	decision should typically be easy to arrive at
Long discussion	no	no consensus reached and other unclear cases

- Clear accepts/rejects will not be discussed
- Approvals will not receive discussion unless there is a veto, but may be revisited in later comparisons
- Short discussions will be about rather clear cut recommendations that should easily convert to decisions
- Long discussions will be needed for strongly contested submissions and/or borderline cases

Foundations Track Discussion Needs

Phase II

Category	# (NIV)
Submitted	83 (5)
Desk rejected	3 (0)
Early rejects	43 (0)
Remaining	37 (5)

Phase III

Category	#	Submissions
Clear accepts	6	22,37(NIV),45,48,69 (NIV),16
Clear rejects	9	137,7 (NIV),123 (NIV),55,68,129,12,58,33,82
Approve	0	
Short discussion	3	54,38,73
Long discussion	18	41, 34, 83, 30, 127, 115 (NIV), 121, 106, 107, 67, 14, 60, 92, 15, 5, 10, 21

Practice Track Discussion Needs

Phase II

Category	#
Submitted	39
Desk rejected	0
Early rejects	16
Remaining	23



Phase III

Category	#	Submissions
Clear accepts	5	36, 62, 77, 93, 110
Clear rejects	1	141
Approve	2	53, 102
Short discussion	5	26, 87, 95, 98, 122
Long discussion	10	25, 44, 50, 64, 78, 91, 108, 112, 117, 126

Acceptance Rates

Our aim is to accept good submissions
while keeping acceptance rates in line with previous years

Past Acceptance Rates



Continuing the trend would result in roughly

- 21 FT papers (25.3%)
- 11 PT papers (28.2%)
- 32 in total (26.2%)

Acceptance Rates

Straight forward accepts

- **FT** 10 papers
- **PT** 7 papers

FT 83 papers overall

25 papers $\mapsto$ 30.1% (+15)

24 papers $\mapsto$ 28.9% (+14)

23 papers $\mapsto$ 27.7% (+13)

22 papers $\mapsto$ 26.5% (+12)

21 papers $\mapsto$ 25.3% (+11)

20 papers $\mapsto$ 24.1% (+10)

PT 39 papers overall

12 papers $\mapsto$ 30.8% (+5)

11 papers $\mapsto$ 28.2% (+4)

10 papers $\mapsto$ 25.6% (+3)

F+P 122 papers overall

36 papers $\mapsto$ 29.5%

32 papers $\mapsto$ 26.2%

30 papers $\mapsto$ 24.6%

These numbers are listed to provide an overview;
they do not represent targets

Evaluation Criteria

FT Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria

- Relevance, significance,
- novelty, soundness,
- strength of validation,
- quality of presentation, and
- quality of related work discussions.

Novelty Submissions must clearly and explicitly describe what is novel about their contribution in comparison to prior work.

Validation Results must be validated by

- formal proofs,
- rigorous demonstrations (e.g., rigorous case studies or simulations), or
- empirical evaluations (e.g., controlled experiments or surveys).

Artifacts Authors are strongly encouraged to make the artifacts used for the evaluation publicly available. Anonymization of github repositories is possible by, e.g.: <https://anonymous.4open.science>

New ideas and Vision Papers Evaluation Criteria

Primary criteria

- degree of originality and
- potential for advancing innovation in the field

Further criteria

- description of shortcomings of the state-of-the-art
- relevance,
- correctness, and
- impact of the idea/vision.
- New ideas and visions need not be fully worked out and a detailed roadmap need not be provided.

Artifacts Authors are strongly encouraged to make any artifacts publicly available,

PT Evaluation Criteria

Primary criterion Strength of relevant findings about practice-relevant MBE applications

Specifically

- reliable data on technologies that work or do not work
- valuable lessons-learned and insights gained
- analysis of results

Was not explicitly stated in the CfP, but is welcome

- education practice

What is not required

- original technology

What we do not want

- submissions that propose new technology and apply it in non-practice-relevant contexts

One idea of the Practice Track is to make it easier for practitioners to become MODELS authors, however not by using watered down FT criteria, but to invite what is easier for them: Reporting on real-world usage

Discussion Process

We will use ZOOM for the PB meeting
Please join at <https://vuw.zoom.us/my/thomas.kuehne>

Conflicts of Interest

- We have collected
 - COIs you declared
 - COIs resulting from you being an author in a different track
 - Approved COIs authors declared against you
- If you notice a COI that we could not detect in the above manner, please let us know in advance or once the respective paper comes up
- We will invite you to a breakout room if you have a COI with a paper and will invite you back again after the discussion has concluded

Paper Discussion Categories & Presentation

Short discussion (ca. 5 min)

- We briefly discuss the paper to see whether we agree with the recommendation

Long discussion (ca. 12 min)

- We need a more in-depth discussion to find a decision

Please summarize

- Strengths and weaknesses of the paper
- Discussion dynamics
- Disagreement among the reviewers if applicable

Discussion Schedule

Time	Track	Submissions
11:00 – 12:00	PT	50, 87, 95, 91
12:30 – 13:30	FT	(48), 38, 83, 121, 82
13:30 – 14:00	PT	78, 98, 26
14:00 – 15:30	FT	41, (22, 37), 54, 34, 30, 127, (69), 115 (NIV)
16:00 – 17:00	FT	106, 107, 67, 73, 15
17:00 – 18:45	PT	108, 64, 122, 25, 44, 112, 117, 126
19:15 – ...	FT	14, 60, 92, (45), 5, 10, 21

(#) = clear accepts
= short discussion

- The schedule may change dynamically based on discussion needs
- Please join all discussions you are available for, i.e., not just those concerning submissions of your track

After the PB Meeting

- Please write MR3 metareviews as soon as possible
 - summary of decision process
 - to be entered into the "Metareview:" text field (like MR1)
 - update the metareview recommendation
 - cf. "Phase IV" of the PB Guidelines (starting on p. 7)
- Author notification will be on 26 June (AoE)
- We will most likely have to decide on "best paper" and "best reviewer" awards via email, i.e., we will only take notes during the meeting but will unlikely be able to make final decisions

Questions?

Please email any questions you may have to
models2023-PC-chairs@easychair.org