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Context

- Publishing venue has been recurring discussion in the community
- In summer 2023, the Trustees decided to address the question openly

The board of trustees decided to have a consultative survey to collect the opinion of the community.

- Position statements given in AAR Newsletter 142, October 31, 2023
  - Renate Schmidt for LNCS
  - Marijn Heule for LIPIcs
- Survey sent to all CADE and AAR members
  (two identical forms, but response can be identified coming from CADE or AAR members)
- Invitation to answer the survey sent on February 28, 2024
- Survey closed end of May, 2024
The survey

Part 1

- Two symmetrical questions were asked
- Answer range from 1 ("not at all") to 5 ("yes, absolutely")
- Various possibilities to comment

The questions:

- *Do you think we should keep on publishing the CADE proceedings with LNCS/Springer?* (1-5)
  
  *Could you elaborate on the above answer?*

- *Do you think we should change from LNCS to LIPIcs proceedings for CADE?* (1-5)
  
  *Could you elaborate on the above answer?*
The survey
Part 2

- Can you comment on the effect of a change from LNCS to LIPIcs for the visibility, evaluation, ranking of your work?
- Does the AAR Newsletter include all relevant arguments? What else should the board of trustees consider in favour of either LNCS or LIPIcs that is not covered?
- What Open Access (OA) funding is currently available in your environment (institution/country/...)? What do you need to do to obtain Open Access funding for a conference paper? Would your environment be supportive of Green OA? (Shortly: Gold OA is fully open, Green OA is self-archiving. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access for more information)
- Any other comment?
Results (1/8)

- 82 answers in total
  - 39 answers from recipients of the CADE call for survey
  - 31 answers from recipients of the AAR call for survey
  - 2 answers by email
  - for comparison: 79 votes at the last CADE Trustee election

- nearly everybody provided names/institution
  - a big majority are well-known as contributors to CADE/IJCAR
  - no evidence of unusual voting patterns/ballot stuffing

- many written replies to free-text questions,
  almost no numbers-only answers
Do you think we should keep on publishing the CADE proceedings with LNCS/Springer?

1 ("not at all") to 5 ("yes, absolutely")
Do you think we should change from LNCS to LIPIcs proceedings for CADE?
1 ("not at all") to 5 ("yes, absolutely")
No significant difference when comparing responses. . .

- from junior and senior people
- from the CADE invitation and from the AAR invitation
Results (5/8)
Free-text feedback (LNCS)

- **Production ease/quality**
  - Most frequent grievance: inefficient or bad Springer typesetting/production process
  - One occurrence: problems with Springers production process are overstated

- **Reputation**
  - Many consider that Springer is established, respected, and has longevity
  - Some consider that Springer/LNCS reputation has gone down
  - One occurrence: LIPIcs may accept low-quality conferences for political reasons in the future
  - One occurrence: CADE has by now a better reputation than LNCS

- **Business model**
  - Many respondents prefer full Open Access and/or less commercial publisher
  - Many feel that Springer is too expensive
  - Some feel that Springer price is acceptable
  - Some remark that Springer Green OA would be a cheaper alternative than Gold OA
  - One occurrence: respondent’s institution requires full Open Access publisher
Once occurrence: Springer provides (in theory more accessible) HTML version
Once occurrence: Springer has served us well
Once occurrence: Indexing for LNCS is good, for LIPIcs unknown
Several respondents remark that others (SAT, CP, FSCD, ITP) have already moved to LIPIcs with good results
A few respondents write that CADE and IJCAR (and FroCoS, TABLEAUX (and JAR)) should have the same publisher
Results (7/8)
Free-text feedback (LIPIcs)

- Production ease/quality
  - Many respondents report good former experience with LIPIcs
  - Some respondents write that LIPIcs format is better, has professional typesetting
  - Some respondents remark that LIPIcs proceedings are directly based on author’s files: no retyping, no style change, no proof reading of heavily reworked documents
  - One occurrence: good submission tools
  - One occurrence: bad experience with LNCS

- Reputation
  - Some write that LIPIcs is more selective
  - Some write that Springer/LNCS reputation and quality has gone down
  - Some write that LIPIcs is less prestigious/less visible
  - One occurrence: good conferences increase reputation of LIPIcs
Results (8/8)

Free-text feedback (LIPIcs), continued

- Business model
  - Some write LIPIcs is run professionally and there is no doubt about its survival
  - One occurrence: publicly funded editors longevity is not guaranteed
  - One occurrence: there is no need for a commercial publisher anymore
  - A few write that LIPIcs board biased towards initiators, whereas commercial publishers are more independent
  - Many remark that LIPIcs is committed to open-access, and is non-profit/community oriented
  - Many remark that LIPIcs is less expensive, and can easily be integrated in conference fees
  - One occurrence: some universities reject the hybrid model, e.g. LNCS, with fees for OA to authors, otherwise to readers

- Miscellaneous
  - Some say that the move to LIPIcs should be done with FroCoS, TABLEAUX, and IJCAR
  - Some say moving to LIPIcs might be too soon
  - One occurrence: maybe we can make LNCS change their processes?
Visibility, Evaluation, Ranking

- Most frequent comment: No changes expected
  - Good experiences with ITP and SAT
  - Conference ranking/prestige is more important than publisher (2nd most frequent comment)
- Some saw more prestige for LNCS, a few for LIPIcs
- Some expect more visibility with LIPIcs
- Full Open Access is preferred
  - Requirement by funders (e.g. Plan S)
  - Personal preference
- Indexing (Scopus, Web of Science) is important
Comments on the AAR position statements

- All relevant arguments were well covered (most frequent comment by far)
- Not all relevant arguments were listed
  - Missing: Unreasonable timelines and lack of diffs with Springer
  - Missing: Springer will be here in 20 years
  - Missing: Indexing information for LIPIcs
  - Missing: Discussion of composition of editorial bord of LIPIcs
  - Missing: Discussion of “Plan S” (Springer does not meet objectives)
  - Missing: Effect on IJCAR if CADE goes LIPIcs
  - Missing: Effect on JAR if CADE goes LIPIcs
  - Missing: Connection of CADE community to Dagstuhl via Deduction seminars
- We had both “Springer’s provision of HTML for accessibility was not covered” and “Springer’s provision of HTML for accessibility is overrated”
- Several general comments for or against specific arguments and/or publishers
Several comments mentioned the importance of indexing

Indexing of LNCS was covered in the AAR newsletter arguments

We have contacted LIPIcs to inquire about indexing

- Scopus indexes LIPIcs
- DBLP indexes LIPIcs
- Google Scholar uses the provided API to index LIPIcs
- Several smaller services index LIPIcs
- Clarivate (Web of Science, CPCI) decides on a per-conference basis, not a per-publisher base
  - LIPIcs is in contact with Clarivate and tries to get conferences they publish in

See https://www.dagstuhl.de/en/publishing

LIPIcs and LNCS indexing efforts are similar, actual outcome in practice is hard to determine
Conclusion

- The topic has been discussed over several years
- We held a **consultative** survey to collect the *opinion* of the community
  - Most survey participants feel well-informed
  - Most survey participants appreciate the quality of the debate
- A big majority of the CADE community is in favor of a change towards LIPIcs...
  - ...but the sentiment is not unanimous
  - ...but maybe not without IJCAR and its other constituent conferences
- We need more information
  - What do IJCAR, TABLEAUX, FRoCOS want?
  - Would LIPIcs accept all these?
- Suggestion: Bring the discussion to the IJCAR level
  - Are the constituent conferences willing to move to LIPIcs?
  - Is LIPIcs willing to take the other constituent conferences together with CADE?