

8th **Sound and Music Computing Conference:**
report and tips for future organizers
Federico Avanzini

Contents

0	Initial set-up	1
0.1	Choosing the dates	1
0.2	Choosing the venue	1
0.3	Defining WorkPackages	1
1	Technical Program	2
1.1	CFP	2
1.2	Reviewers	2
1.3	Reviewing model and workflow	3
1.4	Review assignments and schedule	5
1.5	Final selection and TP structure	6
1.6	Quality and assessment of review process	7
2	Music Program	8
2.1	CFP	8
2.2	Submissions and selection	9
3	Summer School	9
3.1	Schedule and practicalities	10
3.2	Format and contents	10
4	Admin and logistics	11
4.1	Budget and other numbers	11
4.2	Proceedings and conference materials	12
4.3	Registrations	14
4.4	Venue, staff, schedule	14
5	Communication and fund raising	15
5.1	Communication with contributors	15
5.2	Communication with general public	16
5.3	Fund raising	16
A	Templates (invitations, instructions, notifications)	18
A.1	Invitation to TPC	18
A.2	Instructions to TPC	19
A.3	Assignment to TPC	20
A.4	Invitation to reviewers	20
A.5	Instructions to reviewers	21
A.6	Assignment to reviewers	21
A.7	Invitation to Session Chairs	22
A.8	Instructions to Session Chairs	22
A.9	First call for participation	23
A.10	Call for participation to Summer School	24
A.11	Notifications (technical program)	25
A.12	Notifications (music program)	26
A.13	Sponsorship request	26
B	Documents	27
B.1	Guidelines for reviewers	27
B.2	Review form	31
B.3	Feedback from TPC, reviewers and participants	35

0 Initial set-up

0.1 Choosing the dates

General guideline: July is good because there are few collisions with other conferences and because it's a reasonable month for a summer school. Also, graduating master students can write a paper about their master project in spring (in this sense late submission deadlines and late conference dates are good). Problem: July is bad for Scandinavian countries (they have vacations).

We choose the first week of July mainly because it was good for our administration (later in the month would have been worse). We also hoped to have more attendance from Scandinavia (people starting vacations immediately after – or rather at – the conference). In fact we have had registered participants from Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark. Although we do not have numbers from Porto 2009 and from Barcelona 2010 to compare. Potential collisions were checked for the following conferences:

- asa (American Acoustical Society) meeting
- cmmr (Computer Music Modeling and Retrieval)
- dafx (Digital Audio effects)
- eusipco
- forum acusticum
- have
- ica (Int. Conf. on Acoustics) and isma (Int. Symp. on Musical Acoustics) only in 2010 and 2013
- icassp
- icmc
- icad
- ismir
- neuromusic
- nime
- ieee mmisp (IEEE Workshop on Multimedia Sig. Process.)
- waspaa

Tips

- Check for collisions with Summer Schools (e.g., Sum.Sch. on Auditory Cognition, etc.). We did not.
- Check for collisions with submission deadlines. We did not. In fact, extended Dafx deadlines happened to be almost the same as ours.

0.2 Choosing the venue

Oral sessions: one should allow space for >200 people. Our main hall had space for 350 and we had about 160-170 people, including everyone (registered participants, invited/curators, local organizers, staff, musicians).

Poster sessions: one should allow enough space, also for putting tables in front of the posters. Posters should be close to the oral session hall, possibly colocated with catering in order to be visited during coffee-breaks and lunches. There should be power available (for demos).

Concerts: allow for more space, if concerts are open to the general public (as it was in our case). Our auditorium had space for about 600 people. The venue for the music program should be close to that of the technical program, in order to optimize the schedule. In our case the Conservatory was 500m away from the University.

Satellite events: allow rooms for parallel tutorials the first day (if you have any).

0.3 Defining WorkPackages

We defined 5 distinct and rather orthogonal WorkPackages

1. Technical Program
2. Music Program
3. Summer School
4. Admin and logistics
5. Communication and fundraising

1 Technical Program

1.1 CFP

Before releasing the first CFP one has to define

- Topics
- Technical Program Committee (TPC)

Topic list. Was a bit different than the one of Barcelona 2010. Starting from the Barcelona topics, we tried to cluster narrow topics into broader ones. Some topics were added. From the use that authors and reviewers made of topics, it appears that topics were not always interpreted univocally, suggesting that there are some ambiguities and superpositions.

Technical Program Committee was selected according to the following guidelines.

- Make it small: 20 people, very motivated and committed to carry out the (many) tasks assigned to TPC members this year.
- Include several young (or almost young) researchers. One of the points of the “SMC identity” is that it is especially targeted at young researchers, so we wanted a young TPC.
- Do not automatically include representatives of the SMC Steering Committee, unlike in some previous SMC editions. The underlying idea is that the Steering Committee has a different (supervisory rather technical/scientific) role.
- Choose balanced competences. We used the following four “macrotopics”
 1. Processing of sound and music signals
 2. Understanding and modeling sound and music
 3. Interfaces for sound and music
 4. Assisted sound and music creation

and choose people in order to have at least 5 competent TPC members per topic.

- Include 1 or 2 of next year’s organizers: this is helpful for getting them involved. It was so in 2010-Barcelona (Avanzini), and we did the same this year (Serafin, Sturm).

The call for participation included all relevant information (dates, places, etc.). Some noticed that the first call did not mention that Padova is in Italy, this missing info was added in later calls.

Incentives to participation

- As soon as we could, we announced a special issue of the Journal of New Music Research, hopefully this attracted submissions.
- In the website we included extensive touristic information about Padova, Venice, etc. to tease potential participants.

Tips

- The CFP should mention explicitly that the only allowed language is english. Our CFP did not. We received one submission in italian.
- The CFP should mention explicitly that only original (not previously published elsewhere) material can be submitted. Our CPF did not. We had a couple of submitted papers which had already been published. They were rejected for this reason, and authors did not complain. However this should be stated in the CFP.
- Possible additional incentive to participation. Try to have the proceedings indexed in relevant public – and free – databases. A couple of examples.
 - One participant suggested to have the proceedings submitted to ISI Web of Knowledge.
 - I thought of having them submitted to the DBLP Computer Science Bibliography, relevant to computer science people (<http://www.informatik.uni-trier.de/~ley/db/>)

1.2 Reviewers

The panel of reviewers was put together well before the start of the review process, mostly during the first half of February. All reviewers were invited individually (using EasyChair facilities), not added by default. Among other things, the invitation mentioned the review period and expected number of assigned papers.

The goal was to have >150 reviewers. At the end we got 135. In most cases it was necessary to send reminders in order to obtain a reply. We had 23 people who declined the invitation because of competing commitments. We also had 11 people who never replied to the invitation and reminders.

The list of invited reviewers was compiled based on the following criteria.

- We started from the list of SMC2010 reviewers
- We discarded from such list those reviewers who did not complete their review commitments in 2010, or sent very low-level reviews (according to our – Federico, Giovanni, Davide – subjective judgement).
- We made a list of new reviewers, not previously involved in SMC
- We asked the TPC to provide additional names of potential reviewers to be included in the list

Tips

- In order to select your reviewers, start using the scores from this year's "Reviewers' reviews" (see Sec. 1.6 below).
- Many reviewers were very happy to know in advance that a max. of 3 papers would be assigned to them, and accepted the invitation because of that.
- Write very detailed instructions to reviewers, with deadlines, technical details, etc.
- One reviewer complained that our reminders for review did not contain the relevant links to EasyChair and that he had lost the first mail with the links. It's a good idea to always include relevant links in all communications.

1.3 Reviewing model and workflow

The initial goal was to have at least 3 reviews per submitted paper (in order to allow for a fair decision), and 3 papers per reviewer (in order not to overload reviewers). This goal was achieved.

Model

Although a double-blind reviewing model (both submissions and reviews are anonymous) was used in some past SMC editions, we decided to let reviewers know who the authors are. Especially in our small research community is easy to guess an anonymous author anyway. Moreover knowing the authors is useful to check their previous work.

We used a two-tier model of review committee where non-chairs are divided in two kinds: "ordinary" members and "senior" members (according to EasyChair terminology). In our case, "senior" members are our TPC members, while "ordinary" members are the reviewers. Each paper is assigned to a number of ordinary members and exactly to one senior. For each paper, ordinary members write reviews, while the senior writes a so-called metareview based on those reviews. In our case, we also asked seniors to write an ordinary review only in case that one reviewer did not do his job.

In summary the process went like this:

1. assign each paper to 1 senior only and to 3 reviewers
2. reviewers write their reviews
3. seniors add their own review if one is missing
4. seniors write metareviews for all their papers

We think that in general this has worked very well. The only potential problem (common to all conferences) is that there are no means (and no time) to check whether final manuscripts of accepted papers met reviewers' remarks. This is potentially very bad: if a reviewer does a super-accurate review and then sees that it had no consequences on the final manuscript, next time he will be much less motivated. A tip about this below.

Review form and metareview

Review form. In addition to the overall score (7 levels, from -3 [Strong Reject] to 3 [Strong Accept]), the review form included the reviewer's confidence. This was a useful info. Moreover we included individual scores for each of the five main evaluation criteria: originality, significance of the contribution to the field, quality of research, quality of writing, contribution to the conference program. Although these additional scores had no weight in the final ranking of papers (only overall score and confidence were used), we think they were useful

to both reviewers and authors. Finally we included two additional fields: Suggested format (oral/poster), and Candidate for Best Paper Award (Yes/No).

The metareview does not contain scores: it has a field for comments (possibly with a summary of the reviews) and a binary recommendation (accept/reject). We asked TPC members to use metareview comments to justify recommendation especially for problematic papers (e.g. papers with conflicting reviews), and to suggest the best presentation format (oral/poster).

Only the reviews were sent to authors. The metareviews were not. We used them only as an internal tool by which TPC members give their recommendations to the TP Chairs.

Tips

- In general we had extremely positive feedback about the quality of the reviews. Also, adding a second level with the metareview was helpful to us. At the moment of making the final selection we read again all the reviews and the metareviews and in most cases (with possibly 1 or 2 exceptions) we ended up following the metareview recommendation. We suggest to maintain this model.
- Problem: there has been some confusion in the role of seniors. Initially we wanted each senior to choose by himself the reviewers for his papers. Then we decided to centralize the decision, both because of technical difficulties with EasyChair, and because this was the only way to keep complete control on the involved reviewers, on their total no. of assigned papers, etc.
- Instructions for TPC members about the use of EasyChair should have been more structured: many TPC members wrote to us with questions about how to assign papers to reviewers (although they were not supposed to), how to send reminders to reviewers, whether they would be automatically notified of new incoming reviews, etc. So prepare more detailed instructions!
- Find a way to check whether final manuscripts of accepted papers met reviewers' remarks. A possible partial solution: when uploading the final manuscript, authors of accepted paper should also upload their response to reviewers (replying point by point to remarks and explaining how they met those remarks). Then there will be no time for a second round of review, but having this response already gives some indications. In EasyChair can this be done through the "rebuttal" mechanism? Check.
- Some suggest to have an even number of score levels in the review form: this way a reviewer cannot select the mean level and is forced to make a choice. Not sure it would really make a difference.
- It might make sense to send also metareviews to authors: similar to comments by an associate editor to authors of a journal paper. Think about that.
- Other EasyChair technicalities
 - Choosing the EasyChair configuration where seniors also write ordinary reviews was not good: they needed to enter an empty review in order to be able to see other people's reviews, they were sent reminders together with ordinary reviewers, etc. This configuration is really meant for a situation where seniors always write a review before the metareview, while in our case a senior writing a review was an exception. It is probably better choosing the configuration where seniors write only metareviews. However, then one should check how seniors/reviewers see each other in this configuration (mails, notifications, reminders, etc.). Also one should find a way to let seniors write anyway a review in exceptional cases (possible solution: probably a senior can assign a review to himself through the subreviewing mechanism).
 - Communication issues. One should find a way to let ordinary reviewers know who their senior is, at the moment of assignment. This way, when their senior sends reminders they understand what's happening (we had cases of people not understanding why reminders were not sent by TP Chairs but by someone else). Related to this: when a senior sends a reminder, replies from reviewers go to the default EasyChair address (forwarded to TP Chairs and not to seniors). This is another potential source of confusion.
 - We had a maximally collaborative configuration in which – after submitting their reviews – reviewers saw each other's names, saw each other's reviews, could update their reviews at any time until the deadline. Is this completely ok? Are there drawbacks? For instance, one reviewer may upload an empty review, then gain access to other people's reviews and copy them.

Best paper award

The review process also included the selection of the SMC2011 best paper. Mechanism:

- A reviewer could nominate one or more paper that he reviewed, if he considered it to be a candidate for the Best Paper Award
- We short-listed all the papers that received at least a nomination by one reviewer. Papers (co-)authored by SMC2011 local organizers were excluded from the list. In the end we had a short-list of 20 candidate papers.
- The TPC members were given this list. Each TPC could vote for one or more of the papers in the list
- To form the final ranking, all the votes by TPC members were summed (with equal weight) to the reviewers' nominations

Problems and tips

- Only 10/20 TPC members gave their votes. Reason: this was not among their tasks initially, we asked for their votes quite late and many had no time to read carefully 20 papers. Think at a different mechanism? Use a smaller dedicated committee of 3-5 volunteers, instead of the whole TPC? In Porto 2009 they had a voting system by all conference participants. Every mechanism has its own drawbacks.
- Think at having also a Best Student Paper Award. First author must be a student? One author must be a student? All authors must be students?
- Another idea: Best First Paper Award: for authors presenting their first paper (ever) at a conference. Some conferences do that. Google for "Best First Paper Award" and check rules.
- In our case the Award was a certificate. We should have prepared a gift also. . .

1.4 Review assignments and schedule

Assignment criteria

Papers were assigned to reviewers using the automatic assignment tool available in EasyChair. This is based on the following two criteria:

- Matching between paper topics and reviewer's topics.
- Paper bidding by reviewers.

Topics are the conference topics discussed above. At the moment of submission, authors select any subset of topics that are relevant to the paper. Similarly, a reviewer can select any subset of topics that are relevant to his expertise.

Paper bidding is a mechanism available in EasyChair where, after the completion of paper submission, a reviewer can set his preferences: papers I would like to reviews, papers I can review, papers I do not want to review, papers with which I have a conflict of interests.

Problems and tips

- Force reviewers to log early into EasyChair (ideally immediately after accepting to be reviewers), and to select their relevant topics. It was surprisingly hard to have everyone do so!
- Force reviewers to set their bids before assignment. This was an even harder task than the one above! In the end only about 50% of reviewers did set their bids. Possible reason: this tool is not seen very often, people are not used to it. Personal opinion: it is an **essential** tool in order to make senseful assignments. Especially at SMC, where the spectrum of topics is very wide, assigning reviews only using matching of topics is not enough. It could also be that our topics were not the best possible ones, as already discussed. We had one reviewer complaining loudly that his assigned papers had nothing to do with his area of expertise: he had only selected his topics but had not set his bids, and in theory the matching between his topics and his papers' topics was perfect.
- Force reviewers and authors to choose a limited amount of topics (e.g., 4 for reviewers and 3 for paper authors). We did not. We had some reviewers selecting 13/20 or 12/20 topics, which makes no sense and makes the assignment almost random. Same comment applies to paper topics.
- Other EasyChair technicalities related to assignment
 - Before running assignment, you can set individual assignment limits for reviewers (e.g. 1-3). You can use 0-0 to exclude reviewers from assignment.

- After closing paper bidding, and before running assignment, you should insert manually all the conflicts of interests that have not been automatically detected by EasyChair nor have been set by reviewers during bidding. Go to Administration → Conflicts.
- We had a few duplicate submissions, created by mistake by authors. These are not caught by EasyChair. You should check manually for duplicate submissions before running assignment.
- You can run assignment for seniors only, and check/change that before running assignment for reviewers.

Schedule

Perhaps not surprisingly, with very few exceptions reviewers uploaded their reviews on the very last day before the deadline for review completion. Problem: hard to understand in advance who is working and who is not. Some (about 5) reviewers asked not to review one or more of their assigned papers, because of lack of time, or because of mismatch with their expertise. Some of these asked this in the very last days before the deadline for review completion, and we had to find alternative reviewers to write reviews in a very short time.

We gave 4 weeks of review + 2 weeks for submitting final manuscripts after notification of acceptance. There was no extension of submission deadline. However we made a “partial” extension (like they did in Barcelona 2010): papers had to be submitted by the original deadline (March 25), but we allowed 1 more week to update manuscripts. This was a good idea: from the authors’ side it was a 1-week extension, from our side it was not because all paper authors, titles, abstracts, draft manuscripts were already there and we could start the first steps of the review process: paper bidding and assignment.

We had 2-3 authors asking for additional extensions, motivated by personal reasons. We gave them the additional extension. Moreover, we made an exceptional extension for authors based in Japan, due to the earthquake that struck the country on March 11. The extension was granted to anyone requesting it (2 papers in the end).

Tips

- Positive result: all the initial deadlines (except for the “partial” extension of the submission deadline) and dates of notification were perfectly respected. Therefore the schedule was ok. Four weeks for review are ok. Two weeks for revised version is not much although probably ok.
- However the week between the deadline for review completion (Friday, april 29) and the notification of results (Friday, May 6) was very short: we had to collect late reviews, seniors had to write metareviews, then we had to make the final selection. It may be worth allowing a few more days, perhaps setting the deadline for review completion a few days earlier.
- When making the schedule, plan in advance deadline extensions.

1.5 Final selection and TP structure

We needed to have the Technical Program grid ready well before the selection results, in order to know exactly how many papers we wanted to accept. Our structure:

- 1 day (wed.) for satellite events (Rencon Workshop) + 2.5 days (thu.-fri.-sat. morning) for conference.
- Oral sessions: slots of 20 minutes each (presentations + questions). Sessions made of 4 or 3 papers.
- Poster sessions: one per day, with 15 posters each (more than that is too much), for a total of 45 posters.
- Poster crazes: before each poster session, slots of 2 minutes each (1 slide) for a total of $15 \times 2 = 30$ minutes.
- One keynote speaker: one hour for presentation + questions.
- Breaks: 1 hour for morning coffee break (it’s also a poster session). No less than 1.5 hours for lunch, to let people eat, chat, and look at posters. Just 30 mins. for afternoon coffee break.
- Given all the above boundary conditions, we planned 9 oral sessions: 8×4 papers + 1×3 papers, for a total of 35 oral presentations.

The final selection was done in a few steps. First we discarded the lowest ranked papers and accepted the highest ranked papers. Then we started looking in the middle of the ranking and iterated a few times the selection. Although we looked at all reviews and papers, in the end we agreed with the metareview recommendations (with possibly 1 or 2 exceptions).

The choice between oral and poster was not based on overall quality. Roughly, we selected for oral presentations those paper who were sufficiently appealing for a wide audience. We selected as posters papers with a more specific and narrow focus. An example: paper 173 about an extension of the Open Sound protocol. Interesting and well written but probably not suited for oral presentation. In addition, all papers originally submitted as posters by the authors were selected as posters by default.

Oral sessions were constructed according to a bottom-up approach: first select papers for oral presentations, then try to cluster them in meaningful and homogeneous sessions. It worked better than expected. Instead, poster sessions were simply constructed by grouping posters in order of submission number (then we made some swaps upon authors' requests).

Tips

- Note that at the moment EasyChair is lacking tools to create the technical program. For instance it would be useful to be able to group accepted papers by topic and things like that. Everything was done on paper.
- Make some overbooking. Our target (oral+poster) was 35+45. We accepted 35+49, in the end we had 35+43 (6 withdrawn accepted posters).
- You may expect some complaints by rejected authors after notification. We did not have many. We had one author complaining about reviewers not understanding his work: the paper was accepted as a poster and he wanted to have a slot in an oral session. He ended up withdrawing the paper.
- Plan some extra time in oral sessions, to deal with delays. Our 4-paper oral sessions were 90 min. long (instead of $20 \times 4 = 80$ min).
- Plan the poster craze: this has already become a tradition of SMC. It's good, it's a fun session (with the 2min. time and with the countdown on the screen).

Invited speaker(s)

We wanted to have only one keynote: it was hard enough to choose one interesting and appealing keynote, it would have been really hard to find more. Having only one keynote was good also for the budget. . .

Choice criteria:

- Someone able to address the general conference theme, from some angle
- Someone from a different research field from ours (in the end, a philosopher).

He was first contacted in February. It was late, we were lucky that he was still available.

Tips

- We received positive feedback about the idea of picking up an outsider of the SMC community. It's in the SMC multidisciplinary spirit.
- Contact your invited(s) early, no later than December.
- It may be worth asking for a written contribution to go in the proceedings. We thought about that, but it was already too late for him to write down a paper.
- Consider other forms of invited sessions. We did not particularly like the classic idea of a roundtable on a specific topic. However some of the "inspirational panels" in Porto 2009 (e.g., the one on the SMC Roadmap curated by Xavier Serra) were very good: short invited contributions and a lot of discussion from the audience. The degree of success really depends a lot on the curator and the speakers.

Satellite events

In Barcelona 2010 we received the proposal of hosting Rencon in SMC2011. It did fit well in the "intermediate day", between summer school and conference, where previous editions had tutorials.

About 80% of registered participants attended Rencon, so it was successful. This may suggest that satellite workshops on focused themes might be more appealing for participants than tutorials (like in Porto-2009 and Barcelona-2010). We do not have numbers from Porto and Barcelona to compare, though.

1.6 Quality and assessment of review process

Novel tool introduced this year: a structured document of Guidelines for Reviewers, containing both technical and ethical guidelines. Among other things, it discusses the 5 evaluation criteria to be used: originality, sig-

nificance of the contribution to the field, quality of research, quality of writing, contribution to the conference program. Given the very positive feedback by authors about the quality of reviews, hopefully this document was helpful, although we did not have specific feedback about it by reviewers.

Tip: possible addition to the Guidelines for Reviewers. Reviewers should check previous papers by the authors, in order to verify that the paper has not been already published.

Novel tool introduced this year: reviewers' review. After the end of the review process, TPC members had to assess the work of "their" reviewers. Both TPC members and reviewers were aware of this since the beginning. The long-term purpose of this is to create a database of selected SMC reviewers.

We used the following criteria (the same criteria used e.g. by the J. of New Music Research):

- Timeliness
 - 3 Review was on time
 - 2 Review was slightly delayed
 - 1 Review was severely delayed
- Quality Assessment
 - 3 Review was highly relevant
 - 2 Review was sufficient
 - 1 Review was below average

At the moment of writing, 10/20 TPC members have sent their reviewers reviews.

Tips

- Please continue collecting reviewers' reviews, and help establishing a structured database of SMC reviewers. Note however that Yann Orlarey has raised the issue of privacy and handling of personal data, and suggested that creating this database may not be legal. This needs to be further investigated.
- The Timeliness criterion in the reviewers' review may be not entirely appropriate: it makes sense for a journal, possibly less for a conference. . .

Novel tool introduced this year (originally proposed by Dominique Fober): post-review evaluation given by Oral Session Chairs. A session chair should report if one (or more) of his session's papers was not of sufficient scientific quality to deserve a slot in an oral session, in his opinion. The idea is that this information can be used to backtrack what possibly went wrong during the review process.

2 Music Program

We decided to have a relatively small music program (4 concerts, one per day, while in past editions there have been many more). The main reason is that we did not have enough human resources to organize a larger number of concerts with good quality.

We decided to have concert curators. The idea of curated concerts comes from SMC2009 in Porto (see also paper by Guedes et al. on the Computer Music Journal, 2010). Having curators seems to be a good way to give each concert its own specific identity. Also, well-known curators serve to appeal potential contributors. We generally received very positive feedback from participants about the music program and about the "curated approach".

Additionally, we decided to have an opening concert with a "local" program rather than selected pieces of conference participants. The idea was to present a slice of the italian electronic and electroacoustic music scene.

2.1 CFP

Before CFP one has to choose concert curators. We chose ours based on the following criteria

- Well-known composers
- Different personalities and "specialties", to give each concert a different identity
- Different backgrounds and musical traditions: in the end we had one italian, one european, and one non-EU.

Perhaps our curators and concerts were not that much into computer music, and more electronic and electroacoustic music. In this sense our concerts were possibly a bit outside of the SMC tradition.

Tips for the CFP

- The CFP should define clearly all available resources: hall(s), audio-video, lights, etc. It's good to have performers available locally, to minimize expenses. We had the Ex-Novo Ensemble and the Arazzi Laptop Ensemble: the CFP listed the performers/instruments available locally. Composers could bring their own performers, at their own expenses.
- It's good to put limits in duration. We wrote that a max. duration of 10 mins was "strongly encouraged", however several submissions were much longer than that. It might be better to make this a strict requirement rather than a suggestion.
- Define clearly composer's obligations: they have to register in order to have their piece performed. In order to relax a bit this requirement, we wrote that "at least one among the composer(s) and the performer(s) provided by the composer must register to the conference". Despite this, we had 4/18 accepted composers who declined after notification of acceptance, because they had no funding. In one case we were able to substitute a withdrawn piece with another one, which had been previously rejected.
- Let composers indicate which concert/curator they are submitting to, but allow yourself the possibility of reassigning selected pieces to another concert/curator (in case the percentages of pieces submitted to different concerts are very unbalanced).

2.2 Submissions and selection

We required contributors to specify as much as possible their setup and technical requirements, in an accompanying document. We made them send their short bio, and notes about the piece: this info was used later on, to compile the program.

There was no peer-reviewing. Selection was made by Music Chair(s) and concert curators.

Tips

- The percentage of withdrawn pieces after acceptance is high (4/18 in our case). Possible reason: composers are more likely than researchers to have problems with registration (if they do not have academic funding). It might be worth making some overbooking also for the music program. However this is less easy. In the case of posters, if you end up having a session of 16 instead of 15 because of overbooking, it's not a big deal. Instead, if you end up having 10-15 additional minutes of music because of overbooking, it can be more problematic.
- Using EasyChair also for music submissions worked well: people can send a pdf (accompanying doc with setup, technical requirements, short bio, and notes about the piece), plus an attachment (multimedia material about the piece). Concert curators were logged as reviewers in EasyChair, so that they could access music material from there.
- Only one potential problem: EasyChair has a limit of 20 Mb per submission, which is not much for audio and multimedia material (although Chairs can attach larger documents).
- EasyChair technicality. It might be worth using EasyChair in "multitrack" mode: one track for the technical program and one track for the music program. In this way the two workspaces are completely separated. We had both submission types in a single track, and dealing with paper assignment and other things was a bit cumbersome (e.g., music chairs and concert curators had to be excluded manually from paper assignment, technical topics were selected also by musical submissions, etc.).

3 Summer School

This workpackage is largely externalized to summer school teachers. In principle one simply needs to

- Choose the summer school theme
- Choose two teachers plus their tutors
- Let them work

3.1 Schedule and practicalities

Four days is short for a summer school, but it's ok considering that students have to pay for accommodation (sums up to 8-9 nights with the conference).

We started in the afternoon of Saturday, so people could arrive on Saturday morning. Schedule Problem: we did not use adequately the last day (the "Rencon day", Wed.). The Rencon workshop started in the afternoon, in the morning we had half empty day which could have been used for the summer school.

A good number of admitted students is 20. It has probably always been so in past editions. Problem: we had few submissions and some of them were of low quality. We also had some accepted students not attending because of lack of funding, or because their paper for the conference was not accepted.

One of the reasons for the low number of submissions could be that the summer school was organized a bit late (call for participation in January) and was not advertised enough. Don't know about the summer school theme: maybe it wasn't among the hottest current topics? It was interesting for us. . .

Our target was 20 accepted students. In the end we had a total of 22 submissions - 2 rejected (poor CV) - 4 withdrawn = 16 students attending.

Tips

- Make an independent page for the summer school (e.g. a Wordpress) where teachers and students can interact (upload/download teaching materials, chat, upload pictures, etc.). Problem: we did this only on the last day of the summer school, better do it well in advance.
- People should be encouraged to stay for the conference and not only for the summer school (their budget permitting), because the conference is also a chance to learn. We had 6 students staying for the conference, some of them with no papers to present.

3.2 Format and contents

Having lectures plus group projects (in the tradition of SMC summer schools) seemed to be a nice format which works well. Group projects required careful preparatory work by teachers and tutors, though. In our case, more or less all the projects were about setting up a small experiment and analyzing the results. Having groups formally present their final project results in front of an audience, as a closing session of the summer school, was good.

Ideal attendants are PhD students and advanced master students, although we also had other people (one Conservatory teacher, etc.). Students' background is generally very varied (from musicians to engineers). We tried to have one musicologically oriented course (Leon van Noorden) and one more technological course (Federico Fontana). In this way all students could hopefully gain something from the school.

Social activities. We had lunches offered to students and teachers/tutors, at a bar (no catering): it was good for student-student and student-teacher socialization. We had a closing dinner on Tuesday night after student presentations.

Tips

- Plan enough available space for group projects (generally at least 4 different projects, better if each of them has its own room).
- The final presentations could be done in the morning of the "intermediate day" (Wed.), as a "summer school workshop". Registered SMC participants who are already there could attend it.
- Additional ideas for contents that we did not have but could be worth having.
 - More structured presentations of student's research, for instance:
 - * Posters (like in Genova 2008)
 - * Speed talks (like in Stockholm 2007), possibly focused on specific questions and requests of advice addressed by the students to the teachers
 - Grant writing: inviting a EU officer to describe relevant funding scheme, simulating the preparation of a project proposal, etc.

4 Admin and logistics

4.1 Budget and other numbers

Budget simulation was started and updated since 1 year before the conference. All budget numbers are without VAT (+10-20% in Italy).

By far the heaviest expense category was food. Lunch: 16EUR/person. Coffeebreak: 4.5EUR/person. Welcome reception, with wines, drinks, snacks, finger food: 11EUR/person. Dinner: 35EUR/person.

The second heaviest expense category is reimbursement for invited people. Technical Program: 1 keynote; Summer School: 6 teachers/tutors. Expenses here were simulated as 1500EUR/person (travel, accommodation, daily allowance). In the end the average was lower (also because 3/6 summer school teachers were Italian).

Expenses for the music program were kept at a minimum. We reimbursed travel, accommodation, daily allowance to the 3 curators (all attending), and gave an almost symbolic remuneration to our local performers.

The remaining expense categories were, in order of amount spent:

- organization and secretariat (we had an external agency helping us here);
- venue(s): we had to pay both University and Conservatory, for Halls and Auditorium;
- materials: the largest expenses here were USB memories (about 5EUR each) and the printing of the conference guides (about 4.5EUR each).

Problem: in compliance to the policy of the SMC Steering Committee, conference fees were very low, and moreover we had to pay several kinds of taxes on them (e.g., 250EUR of regular fee gave us a net income of about 190EUR after VAT and other taxes). Moreover social events were optional and less than 50% of participants registered to them (see numbers below). We were able to collect about 14000EUR from various sponsors. Only by virtue of this income, we did not have a negative balance at the end.

Tips

- Think at having grants for some summer school students (budget permitting): we had none, they had in Porto 2009. Or, one could make summer school registration free for some students, instead of giving a grant. Free registration is less than a grant, it also has the advantage of simplifying administration.
- Keep the number of non-paying people (organizers, invited, staff, colleagues, friends, relatives, self-invited, ...) under control.
- Some conferences use a "corporate" registration category: in practice participants affiliated with private companies pay more than academics.
- The number of concerts has a strong impact on the incomes from registrations. We had 3 concerts with 15 registered composers, in Barcelona and especially in Porto they had a much larger number of concerts, accepted pieces, registered composers.

Other conference numbers

Positive result: we had submissions from 5 continents and 37 countries. This shows a positive trend for SMC in terms of non-EU participation (see tables). The US are the second contributing country after Italy. We had many submissions from Japan, probably thanks to Rencon.

- Submissions
 - Technical program: 136, 14 of which were withdrawn before/after notification of acceptance
 - Music program: 77, 4 of which were withdrawn before/after notification of acceptance
- Registered participants
 - Early+late regular: 60+8
 - Early+late student: 51+6
 - Accompanying: 4
 - SummerSchool+FullPass: 10+6
- Registered to social events
 - Dinner: 87
 - Venice trip: 70

Note: we had 41 people who registered to the conference although they did not have a paper to present, they only came to attend. This number was higher than we expected.

country	authors	submitted	accepted
Algeria	3	1	0
Australia	7	2.5	0.5
Austria	15	8	8
Belgium	7	1.33	1
Brazil	12	6	3
Canada	21	9	7.33
Chile	1	1	0
Colombia	1	0.5	0
Denmark	4	2.67	1.67
Finland	3	2.5	1.5
France	25	13.83	6.67
France, Metropolitan	-	-	-
Germany	4	4.25	1.25
Greece	7	5	0
Hungary	1	0.2	0.2
Iceland	-	-	-
India	3	1	1
Iran, Islamic Republic of	2	1	0
Ireland	1	0.5	0.5
Israel	1	1	0
Italy	57	38.63	19.13
Japan	28	10.5	7
Latvia	1	0.33	0.33
Netherlands	2	3	1
New Zealand	2	4	0
Norway	5	3.5	3
Poland	2	2	0
Portugal	3	1.5	1
Reunion	-	-	-
Slovenia	-	-	-
Spain	7	4	1
Sweden	7	3.67	2.67
Switzerland	3	2	1
Taiwan	5	5	0
Turkey	1	1	0
United Kingdom	36	21.67	15.67
United States	44	35.92	12.58

country	authors	submitted	accepted
Austria	20	8	5.83
Belgium	7	2.5	2.5
Brazil	6	3	2
Canada	2	1	1
China	2	1	0
Denmark	6	3	3
Finland	7	3.5	2.5
France	27	13.5	11.5
Germany	12	5.17	2.67
Greece	1	1	1
India	6	2.25	0
Iran, Islamic Republic of	2	2	0
Ireland	2	0.5	0.5
Israel	4	1	0
Italy	20	7.67	5.67
Japan	26	10	5
Netherlands	2	1.33	0.33
Norway	1	1	0
Peru	2	1	0
Portugal	8	3.47	2.47
Slovenia	-	-	-
Spain	42	19.68	13.68
Sweden	5	3	0
Turkey	2	1	1
United Kingdom	25	11.77	7.02
United States	17	7.67	7.33

Figure 1: Submissions by country: SMC2011 (left), SMC2010 (right).

4.2 Proceedings and conference materials

Paper template

Template is very simple and modified from the 2010 template. We strongly encouraged authors to use the \LaTeX template rather than the doc. The vast majority of accepted papers used the \LaTeX template.

Many of the accepted papers had several formatting issues. This is the list of the most common issues that we found and that that we asked accepted authors to address.

1. The title has to be 16pt Times, bold, caps, upper case, centered.
2. The maximum length of the paper is 8 pages.
3. Use a 10pt Times font for the text and the captions.
4. Numbers and captions of figures and tables always have to appear below the figure/table.
5. Include the copyright notice exactly as it appears in the lower left-hand corner of the first page.
6. Include in the copyright notice the first author's name.
7. Second level headings are in Times 10pt bold, flush left, with 1 line of space above the section head, and 1/2 space below it.
8. Third level headings are in Times 10pt italic, flush left, with 1/2 line of space above the section head, and 1/2 space below it.
9. All artwork must be centered, neat, clean, and legible. All lines should be very dark for purposes of reproduction and artwork should not be hand-drawn.
10. Leave 1 line space between the figure or table and the caption.
11. Captions should be Times 10pt.
12. Use 8pt font-size for footnotes.
13. Reference numbers inside the text, such as [1], have to respect the word spacing.
14. Each reference number, such as [1], must have the hypertextual link to the "REFERENCES" section.
15. The font of the "References" section has to be 10pt Times.
16. Leave 1 line space between every bibliographical reference within the list of the section "References".

17. Please use the LATEX (strongly encouraged) or the accompanying Word templates to edit your paper.

The templates can be downloaded from the SMC 2011 web site (<http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org>).

Instead of sending this list generically to all accepted authors, our Proceedings Editor Serena Zanolla addressed separately each of the papers with formatting issues, and listed for each one only its subset of formatting issues. This was highly appreciated by accepted authors.

Tips: possible improvements to the L^AT_EX template.

- Give limits of characters in the abstract.
- Use `\MakeUppercase` to make uppercase title automatically
- Fix the footer with CC license: now it always put *et al.* even in the case of 1 author or 2 authors
- For sure many more things can be improved

Proceedings

We used Acrobat Pro to compile the proceedings: make a single pdf, add page numbers, add conference header, add hyperlinks from the Table of Contents and from the Author index. The list of authors can be downloaded from EasyChair, then the corresponding page numbers must be added manually. The table of contents must be done manually.

Tips

- Try to have the proceedings indexed in relevant public – and free – databases (see Sec. 1.1 above).
- We had problems with fonts when compiling everything in Acrobat Pro. Ask for embedded fonts?
- Only make electronic proceedings (they first did so in Barcelona 2010): saves time and money. No one complained, only one participant said that the printed version is good to show to friends and relatives. One suggested setting up some form of print-on-demand service.
- Proceedings must have a ISBN and a CC license. It's a good idea to upload final manuscripts on smcnetwork.org before the beginning of the conference, and link them from the online program. So people can start reading papers before the conference.
- If possible it would be good to include written contributions by the keynote speaker(s) and by the concert curators (describing the theme and rationale of their concerts).

Guide

Proceedings were relatively straightforward to compile. The guide was more complicated, especially to write down a good music program (we needed to ask for feedback from composers after shortening/changing their bios and notes; we needed to collect additional bios for performers; etc.).

Tip: include also practical info (maps, etc.) in the guide.

Materials

Bag (with conference logo) containing

- Conference guide
- Blank sheets for personal notes. Tip: this was much appreciated this year, especially the format (small – A5 – notebook)
- Pen (with conference logo)
- USB memory (with conference logo) containing conference proceedings. Tip: it is worth doing (no less than 2Gb), it is a gadget by itself.
- Additional material provided by sponsors (leaflets, etc.)
- City map, possibly additional touristic material
- One envelope containing personal items:
 - Badge with Name, Surname, Affiliation. Tip: make it front-back so that it is always readable (this was first done in Porto 2009). Use lanyards: they are more comfortable and are a gadget by themselves.
 - Certificate of attendance. Tip: certificates of attendance should be prepared also for summer school students.

- Payment invoice
- Wifi account (if different for each participant)
- Tickets for dinner and/or other social events (only for registered participants). Tip: tickets may be possibly prepared for conference lunches as well.

4.3 Registrations

Registrations flew in smoothly.

Tips

- After acceptance make a table with list of accepted papers/music to keep track of
 - registrations of people associated to papers/music (remember that at least one author or composer/performer needs to register within the early registration deadline in order to have the paper included in the proceedings or the piece performed)
 - submission of final manuscripts

Apparently this cannot be easily managed in EasyChair.

- Give very detailed registration instructions on the registration webpage (about how to fill in the registration form, etc.) in order to minimize requests of clarifications (“What is my Fiscal Code?”, etc.).
- Define a clear cancellation policy to avoid problems.
- Payments with bank transfer must be double checked. Put a deadline, like: if you pay with bank transfer, your money must arrive within 10 days after registration, otherwise the registration will be cancelled.
- Student registrations should be checked to verify their student status.
- It’s worth to provide an “accompanying person” registration category (paying for dinner and/or additional social events).
- Do not include hotel booking in registration: it can become very complex to manage (people changing schedule, adding/removing wives/husbands, etc.), and it’s not worth. However, make list of suggested hotels, possibly with special rates for conference participants. One may ask hotel to reserve rooms up to a certain date.
- Important: suggest low-cost accomodation alternatives especially for summer school students.
- After closure of early registration: create a mailing list of all known participants (registered, invited, etc.): useful to send around instructions for oral/poster presentations, updates about social events, special requests for dinner menu (vegetarian/vegan, etc.), instructions for wifi, dates of arrival/departure, etc. Especially the latter info (dates of arrival/departure) was very useful to estimate the total no. of attending persons for each day, and to size the catering accordingly.
- On-site registrations might be good but not essential. We did not have on-site registration. We had 2 people registering during the conference: we made them use the online submission system, which we kept open.

4.4 Venue, staff, schedule

Things needed at the venue

- Oral sessions: audio-video for presenters; laser pointer for presenters; wifi; at least one pc/laptop with useful sw (office, acrobat reader, multimedia player, . . .); one emergency projector; power plugs; mikes for presenters/session chairs; mikes for questions from the audience; audio-video recording of sessions; camera for pictures; tables for chairs/roundtables, if needed; four sheets with countdown that chairs can show to speakers (5,2,1,0 minutes left)
- Poster sessions: poster holders; tape and other means to attach posters; one table per poster; computer speakers for demos; power plugs
- Reception: signs with arrows to give directions outside and inside the venue; one laptop (online) at the reception desk for registrations; possibly one printer at reception desk;

Our staff

- Summer school: four students helping with any issue, especially with set-ups of group projects.

- Technical Program: 10-12 students helping with preparation of kits (badges etc.) before the conference, moving materials, reception, audio-video recording, taking pictures, assisting speakers with audio-video, carrying mikes around for questions from the audience, assisting poster presenters, surveillance at lunches and coffee-breaks
- Music program: 6-8 students helping with all sorts of technical issues, preparing on-stage set ups, assisting performers, audio-video recording, taking pictures

Tips for schedule

- We had the keynote address on friday: probably everyone is at the conference on friday. Moreover we had it in the slot just before lunch (12:00-13:00), instead of the first slot in the morning. This was good, it maximized attendance. We had positive feedback about this choice.
- Immediately after the keynote we announced the next conference (SMC2012): everyone was there. In general, allow time to make this announcement at some point.
- We wanted to have lunches included in conference fees instead of letting people go outside to bars. This was very good in several respects: allowed for additional social interaction, maximized attendance to posters, helped to start in time the first afternoon session.
- Session Chairs: you will need to contact them at least after the deadline for early registrations, simply because they have to be among those who attend. We contacted them about 3 weeks before the conference. Send detailed instructions to them: in particular, they have to be strict in respecting the schedule and force speakers to close their presentation if they are late.
- We had poster sessions colocated with catering (poster sessions were held during the morning coffee break and during the lunch). This was good, it maximized both time dedicated to poster sessions and attendance. Problem: posters were too close to each other, it was crowded. Also, we did not have space to give a table and power to each poster presenter (needed by many for demos).
- Keep in mind that poster crazes need additional planning. People need to send their single slides in advance in order to have them all ready on one laptop beforehand, etc.
- We had dinner on friday: again, probably everyone is at the conference on friday.
- We made our thanks and the best paper award ceremony at dinner. Good for the atmosphere, however not everyone was there because registration to dinner was optional.

5 Communication and fund raising

5.1 Communication with contributors

Website

General guideline: we wanted to make it simple, possibly static. Among other things, it makes easier to migrate the website to `smc-conference.net` later on. We did not experience need for a CMS. The only possible exception is the News page, which needed frequent updates as the conference approached, and would have benefited from a CMS (although this was not much of a problem).

Calls

We sent around 7 calls starting in oct.2010 (1:technical program; 2:music program; 3:updated call with templates and JNMR special issue; 4:summer school, 5:the “3 weeks left” call; 6:partial extension; 7:registration opening).

Calls were consistently sent to the following mailing lists

- `auditory@lists.mcgill.ca`
- `music-dsp@music.columbia.edu`
- `music-ir@listes.ircam.fr`
- `community@nime.org`
- `aimi@lists.aimi-musica.org`
- `smcnetwork@llista.upf.edu`
- `icad@santafe.edu`

- sid@lists.cost-sid.org
- announcements@enactivenetwork.org

The first call was also sent to the int. journal Music Perception and to the following websites

- [eaa-fenestra](http://www.eaa-fenestra.com)
- <http://www.wikicfp.com/>
- <http://www.confsearch.org>
- [ourGlocal](http://ourGlocal.com)

News and social

We used facebook as a social tool, mostly to share relevant news (in sync with the News page of the conference website) and to upload pictures after the conference. After the conference we totalized 104 subscribers to the facebook social page. There has not been much interaction, but it has probably worked as an efficient tool to share news with subscribers.

Tips

- keep in mind that all the features of smcnetwork.org can and should be used for paper database, etc. This another reason why the conference website can be static.
- Other relevant mailing lists should be included (e.g., users@ccrma.stanford.edu and others).
- A mailing list of past SMC contributors/reviewers should be created and maintained, and calls should be sent to this list.
- Calls should be sent to more journals than we did.
- We did not send posters/flyers around, might be worth doing (possibly only pdf flyers sent by email, that people can print and put on their walls). However we uploaded conference banners online, and in the CFPs we encouraged everyone to put those banners on their webpages to help us advertise the conference (the idea came from Porto 2009).
- Other social networks may be added (twitter, etc.).
- Personal contacts should be probably used more extensively than we did. I sent a few personal mails to colleagues, to advertise the conference, and especially to encourage further submissions to the summer school (only after submission deadline when we realized that we had few submissions).

5.2 Communication with general public

For SMC, communication to the general public makes sense, because of the concerts (in our case all concerts were free and open to the general public). We got our concerts included in a larger concert season organized by the municipality of Padova: they gave no money to us but provided publicity.

We paid an external free-lance journalist, specialized in music, to coordinate communication with the press: it worked, we had several articles on local and national newspapers, and a couple of interviews on national radios. Thanks to this dissemination, at the concerts we had in fact some “local” audience in addition to conference participants. We are not able to tell how many, though.

The Rencon Workshop was also open to the general public (in compliance to the guidelines of Rencon organizers). Consequently, also this event was widely advertised in the press.

Tip: think at the technical topics that are most catchy to the general public, in order to advertise them on the press. As an example, the topic of expressive music-performing machines in Rencon is quite catchy for the general public.

5.3 Fund raising

Companies

We wrote letters to known companies, to invite them to contribute. One of the criteria was to choose companies from which we have recently purchased (expensive) equipment, that has been used at the conference: Phasespace, Yamaha Europe.

We offered visibility on website and printed material, the possibility to include brochures or informative material in the conference participant kits, and a variable number of free passes for the conference. In the end only IK Multimedia sent informative material, others said they would but did not. Some companies actually attended the conference or part of it: Phasespace, Yamaha Europe, IK Multimedia.

Partially related to this: we had a few other people affiliated with private companies who registered to the conference: SoundToys, Zvooq, Yamaha Japan, Codeshop.

Tip: fundraising could and should have probably been more structured. Make a call for sponsorship, offer a wider range of benefits, define sponsorship levels. Something qualitatively (not quantitatively) similar to what they do in larger ACM and IEEE conferences (e.g., <http://www.ismar11.org/index.php/sponsorship>). One concrete possibility for SMC could be offering a stand for the company at the conference.

Other funding sources

We had some funding from the “Fondazione Antonveneta”, the no-profit foundation of a local bank. We had funding from the EU-project “NIW”.

Tip: look for synergies with ongoing EU projects, to fund e.g. specific satellite events, summer school grants, etc.

Appendices

A Templates (invitations, instructions, notifications)

A.1 Invitation to TPC

Dear ...,

[personalizer preamble]

Would you be willing to serve in the TPC? Below I attach some info about how it will work. As you can see, the idea is that the TPC will have a substantial involvement in the selection process. I really hope you can join the TPC, and that you can come to Padova in July for the conference.

Thanks and all the best.
federico

The General Chair is Federico Avanzini (University of Padova) and the Technical Program Chairs are Giovanni De Poli (University of Padova) and Davide Rocchesso (IUAV University of Venice). They will be the persons in charge of coordinating the paper selection process.

The Technical Program Committee (TPC) will have a substantial involvement in the selection process. The TPC will be composed of around 20 members. TPC members should be ready to take on the responsibility of working towards the best possible academic quality.

More precisely, as a TPC member you will have the following tasks:

- 1) you will be responsible to propose "good" reviewers from your area of expertise
- 2) you will be assigned a maximum of 10 papers
- 3) you will be responsible to collect at least 3 reviews per paper, to coordinate the reviews, and to ensure that all reviews are completed on time
- 4) in case of missing reviews, you will be asked to provide reviews yourself
- 5) after the completion of the reviews, you will be asked to read through all of them and to rate the quality of the reviews (your ratings will be used anonymously to establish a database of reviewers for future SMC conferences)
- 6) in case of papers with conflicting reviews, borderline marks, etc., you will be asked to make a final recommendation about those papers

In the Call for participation we will have a simple paragraph on the paper submission like:

All papers will be peer-reviewed according to their novelty, technical content, presentation, and contribution to the overall balance of topics represented at SMC2011. The maximum length is 8 pages, and a length of 6 pages is strongly encouraged. Accepted papers will be designated to be presented either as posters/demos or as lectures. More details of the requirements and guidelines are available on the conference website: <http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/>.

The deadlines will be:

Deadline for submissions of papers: Friday 25 March 2011

Notification of paper acceptances: Friday 6 May 2011

Deadline for submission of camera-ready papers: Friday 20 May 2011

A.2 Instructions to TPC

Dear members of the SMC2011 TPC,

the deadline for paper submissions to SMC2011 is now one day away. Authors have been requested to create their submissions by March 25, although we decided to allow them 7 more days (until Apr. 1) to amend submissions. Therefore we will still be able to start the review process on March 26. As you will see in the attached html, we now have some 135 reviewers in EasyChair, in addition to the TPC. These include the names that you have suggested (thanks).
Let me remind you the next steps to perform.

1) TOPIC SELECTION

If you haven't done so yet, please log in to EasyChair:
<http://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=smc2011>
Once you are logged, check the conference topics and select those topics that are relevant to your areas of expertise: go to SMC2011 -> My Topics
-> If you do not have an EasyChair account, create one.
-> Contact me for any technical problems.

2) BIDDING

Starting from March 26, you should make your bids on EasyChair: go to Paper Bidding -> Make Your Bid.
You will see all submissions ordered by relevance (i.e. the degree of matching between submission topics and your topics).
You will be able to select papers that (i) you would like to review, (ii) you may review if asked, (iii) you prefer not to review, (iv) you cannot review due to a conflict of interest.

3) ASSIGNMENTS

Based on topic selection and bidding, we will assign papers to each of you (in any case no more than 10).
Then we will assign reviewers to each of your papers. Unfortunately EasyChair does not allow you to appoint reviewers, this can only be done by Chairs. Therefore, if you want to suggest suitable reviewers for your papers you should write directly to me and we will make the assignment.

4) REVIEW PROCESS

In principle you are not requested to write reviews yourself, but rather to check the work of your reviewers and ensure that they are on time. As soon as you are assigned your papers, create for each of them an empty review with "0" degree of confidence. Only in case of a missing review from one of your reviewers, you will need to provide a review yourself by editing this empty review.
In case of papers with conflicting reviews, borderline marks, etc., you will be asked to make a final recommendation about those papers. In EasyChair this is done with by writing a "metareview" containing your comments to the Chair and an "accept" or "reject" recommendation.
-> Reviewing time-window: March 28 - April 29
-> Notification of acceptance: May 6

5) EVALUATION OF REVIEWERS

As already mentioned in a previous mail, after the review process we will ask you to evaluate your reviewers. The long term goal is to collect useful information to form a panel of committed reviewers.
You will need to read through all the reviews of your papers, and to evaluate your reviewers using the following criteria:

Timeliness:

- 3 - Review was on time
- 2 - Review was slightly delayed
- 1 - Review was severely delayed

Quality Assessment:

- 3 - Review was highly relevant
- 2 - Review was sufficient
- 1 - Review was below average

We will ask you to send your evaluation (two numbers per reviewer) to us in any format you prefer, then we will collate all the data. The name of the TPC member who did the evaluation will not be saved anywhere.

Best regards,
Federico

A.3 Assignment to TPC

Dear [*FIRST-NAME*],

Enclosed you will find the list of SMC2011 papers assigned to you.

- Remember that you are not requested to write reviews yourself, but rather to supervise the work of reviewers.
- For each of your assigned papers, create an empty review with "0" degree of confidence. This is needed in order for you to be able to see others' reviews.
- The deadline for reviewers is April 29, 2011. Immediately afterwards you will need to write a "metareview" for each of your papers, with your comments to the TP Chairs and an "accept" or "reject" recommendation.
- Only in case of a missing review you will need to provide one yourself by editing your empty review.

Best regards,
SMC2011 TP Chairs

[*ASSIGNMENT*]

A.4 Invitation to reviewers

Dear [*FIRST-NAME*],

I would like to invite you to serve in the panel of reviewers for the 8th Sound and Music Computing Conference (SMC2011). All relevant information about SMC2011 can be found at the conference homepage: [*HOME*]

If you accept my invitation, you will be asked to review a maximum of 3 papers.

The deadline for paper submission is March 25, and the notification of acceptance to authors is set at May 6. Therefore you will need to work on your reviews during April.

I kindly ask you to reply to this invitation within 5 days, following the link above. In case you accept, you will receive further instructions about the EasyChair system and about the review process. Please reply even if you are not willing to accept, and select the "decline" option.

Best regards,
Federico Avanzini <avanzini@dei.unipd.it>
SMC2011 General Chair

A.5 Instructions to reviewers

Dear [*FIRST-NAME*],

thank you for joining the SMC2011 panel of reviewers. Here are some instructions and tips to help you throughout the review process. Please read them carefully.

- 0) Please help us advertise the conference by forwarding the CfP to your relevant contacts and mailing lists. For your convenience, the latest CfP is pasted at the end of this mail.
- 1) At your earliest convenience, log in to EasyChair and verify that your account is working (create an EasyChair account if do not have one.): <http://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=smc2011>
- 2) As soon as you log in to EasyChair, check the conference topics and select those topics that are relevant to your areas of expertise:
On EasyChair, go to SMC2011 -> My Topics
- 3) At the same time, download from the conference website the guidelines for reviewers and read them carefully:
http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/docs/SMC_reviewer_guidelines.pdf
- 4) Immediately after the submission deadline (March 25), set your bids for papers on EasyChair in order to help us assign papers to reviewers. You will receive more detailed instructions about this at a later stage.
- 5) Work on the reviews of your assigned papers (no more than 3 papers will be assigned to you). Please be sure to upload them in due time and no later than April 29.

Best regards,
Federico Avanzini
SMC2011 General Chair

----- SMC2011 Third Call for Participation -----
[...]

A.6 Assignment to reviewers

Dear [*FIRST-NAME*],

Enclosed you will find the list of SMC2011 papers assigned to you for reviewing.

- We did our best to avoid obvious conflicts of interest.
If you have a conflict of interest with some of the papers assigned to you, please notify them to us.
- Download your assignments and upload your reviews on EasyChair.
From the top menu, go to: Reviews -> My Papers
- Please make sure that your reviews are submitted before the deadline: April 29, 2011.
- If you have not done so yet, download from the conference website the guidelines for reviewers and read them carefully:
http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/docs/SMC_reviewer_guidelines.pdf

Best regards,
SMC2011 TP Chairs

[*ASSIGNMENT*]

A.7 Invitation to Session Chairs

Dear [...],

I would like to invite you to chair an oral session at SMC2011:
[Session Title, Date, Time]

The papers of the session are already online and accessible from the conference program:
<http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/programme.htm#glance>

Please let me know if you are willing to accept my invitation.

All the best,

-- federico

A.8 Instructions to Session Chairs

Dear all,

thank you for accepting to chair an oral session of SMC2011.

At the end of this mail you can find the complete list of our Session Chairs.

This info will be online soon.

Now on the online program you can already find all the contents of your session, including the electronic versions of all the papers:

<http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/programme.htm#glance>

I kindly ask you to read in advance the papers of your session. If you wish to contact the authors by email before the conference, you are most welcome to do so. I am attaching to this mail the provisional list of presenting authors.

At the conference you should meet presenters before the start of your session, and help us verify that everything (slides, sound, etc,) is ready and working. Each presenter will have a 20-mins time slot. We suggest to use 15 mins for the presentation and 5 for questions, although this is not mandatory. However the total limit of 20 mins is sharp and I kindly ask you to ensure that it is respected by all presenters during your session.

Of course you are most welcome to ask questions yourself at the end of each presentation, if there is time.

Finally, the SMC Steering Committee has proposed to involve Session Chairs in a sort of post-evaluation of the review process, through a simple procedure: if you think that one (or more) of your session's papers is not of sufficient scientific quality to deserve a slot in an oral session, you should write to me and to the TP Chairs. The idea is that this information can be used to backtrack what possibly went wrong during the review process.

I am looking forward to meeting you in Padova.

Best regards,
federico

SMC2011 Oral Session Chairs

OS1 - Maarten Grachten
OS2 - Alan Marsden
OS3 - Emery Schubert
OS4 - Stefania Serafin
OS5 - Gualtiero Volpe
OS6 - John Dack
OS7 - Haruhiro Katayose
OS8 - Dominique Fober
OS9 - Kjetil Falkenberg Hansen

A.9 First call for participation

[Apologies for cross-postings]
[Please distribute]

8th Sound and Music Computing Conference, 06-09 July 2011
Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova
Conservatorio Cesare Pollini, Padova
<http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/>

The SMC Conference is the forum for international exchanges around the core interdisciplinary topics of Sound and Music Computing. SMC 2011 will feature lectures, posters/demos, musical/sonic works, and other satellite events. The SMC Summer School will take place just before the Conference and it will aim at giving an opportunity to young researchers interested in the field to learn about some of the core interdisciplinary topics and to share their own experiences with other young researchers

=====
=====Important dates=====

Deadline for submissions of papers and music: Friday 25 March, 2011
Deadline for applications to Summer School: Friday 25 March, 2011
Notification of acceptance to Summer School: Monday 18 April, 2011
Notification of paper and music acceptances: Friday 6 May, 2011
Deadline for submission of camera-ready papers: Friday 20 May, 2011
SMC 2011 Summer School: Saturday 2 - Tuesday 5 July, 2011
SMC 2011 Satellite Events: Wednesday 6 July, 2011
SMC 2011 Conference: Thursday 07 - Saturday 09 July, 2011
=====

The topics to be covered at the Conference are all the core ones in Sound and Music Computing research, and can be grouped into:

- . Processing of sound and music signals
- . Understanding and modeling sound and music
- . Interfaces for sound and music
- . Assisted sound and music creation

=====
=====Call for papers=====

SMC 2011 will include paper presentations as both lectures and poster/demos. We invite submissions examining all the core areas of the Sound and Music Computing field. All submissions will be peer-reviewed according to their novelty, technical content, presentation, and contribution to the overall balance of topics represented at the conference. Paper submissions should have a maximum of 8 pages including figures and references, and a length of 6 pages is strongly encouraged. Accepted papers will be designated to be presented either as posters/demos or as lectures. More details are available at http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/call_for_participation.htm
=====

Want to help us promote SMC2011?

Insert a SMC2011 banner in your blog or web page
(available at <http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/img/banner/>),
and link it to <http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/>

Want to follow and share SMC2011 related news?

Join and invite your friends to the SMC2011 facebook fanpage
(linked from <http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/news.htm>)

A.10 Call for participation to Summer School

CfP - 7th SMC Summer School

[Apologies for cross-postings]
[Please distribute]

7th Sound and Music Computing Summer School
"Embodied Sound and Music"
02-06 July 2011, Padova, Italy
Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova
Conservatorio Cesare Pollini, Padova
http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/summer_school.htm

The goal of the SMC Summer School is to give an opportunity to young researchers interested in the field to learn about some of the core interdisciplinary topics of SMC, and to share their own experiences with other young researchers.

This year the focus is on the embodied links between sound, music, and movement. Lectures and hands-on projects will explore this theme from several viewpoints, including novel sound synthesis techniques, multimodal interaction, music cognition, movement analysis and characterization.

Academic Program

- * 8 hours of lectures by Leon van Noorden (University of Ghent, Belgium) on Music and Movement
 - * 8 hours of lectures by Federico Fontana (University of Udine, Italy) on Interactive SMC: The Challenges of Continuous Interaction
 - * 12 hours of hands-on projects focused on the two themes of the Summer School
 - * 2 hours of oral presentations by the participating students
- Lectures are designed to be of interest to any PhD student or researcher in the field of Sound and Music Computing.

Teachers and tutors

- * Leon van Noorden (University of Ghent, Belgium)
- * Bart Moens (University of Ghent, Belgium)
- * Denis Amelynck (University of Ghent, Belgium)
- * Frank Desmet (University of Ghent, Belgium)
- * Federico Fontana (University of Udine, Italy)
- * Maurizio Goia (Conservatorio Tartini Trieste, Italy)
- * Stefano Papetti (University of Verona, Italy)

Application and registration

Applications (deadline: Friday 1 April 2011) must include the following documents in pdf format:

- * Curriculum vitae (max. 1 page);
- * Proof of university enrolment;
- * Short description of the student research interest and motivation to participate (max. 2 pages).

Selected students (notification of acceptances: Monday 18 April 2011) will be able to register through the SMC2011 conference registration page.

A.11 Notifications (technical program)

Note: A=oral accept; a=poster accept; R=reject

Dear [*NAME*]

Thank you for submitting your work to the Technical Program of SMC2011.

[A/a]-> We are pleased to inform you that your paper
[*NUMBER*] - [*TITLE*]

[A]-> has been ACCEPTED for ORAL PRESENTATION and for publication in the
Proceedings of SMC2011.

[a]-> has been ACCEPTED for POSTER PRESENTATION and for publication in the
Proceedings of SMC2011.

[R]-> We regret to inform you that your submission
[*NUMBER*] - [*TITLE*]

has NOT been accepted.

This year we received 136 submissions for the Technical Program, and were able to accept 84. We committed to set up a rigorous and fair review process, and as a result all submissions received no less than 3 independent reviews from expert researchers in the field. Below you can find the reviews for your contribution.

[A/a]-> Your camera-ready paper must be uploaded to EasyChair by
May 20th, 2011:

<http://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=smc2011>

Upon receipt, your camera-ready paper will be checked by the TP Committee in order to verify that you have incorporated changes recommended by the reviewers, and that you have followed carefully the formatting instructions and the SMC2011 templates.

[A/a]-> *Please note*

At least one author of your paper must register to the conference before May 31st, 2011. Failure to have at least one such registration will result in removal of the paper from the Technical Program and from the Proceedings.

[R]-> We hope that SMC2011 will be a great event for the Sound and Music Computing community. We therefore invite you to take part to this event anyway, and give your personal contribution to its success.

The online registration form and related instructions are available at
<http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/registration.htm>

We are looking forward to seeing you in Padova in July.

Best regards,

Federico Avanzini (General Chair),

Giovanni De Poli, Davide Rocchesso (Technical Program Chairs)

A.12 Notifications (music program)

Note: A=accept; R=reject

Dear [*NAME*]

Thank you for submitting your work to the Music Program of SMC2011.

[A]-> We are pleased to inform you that your submission [*NUMBER*] ([*TITLE*]) has been ACCEPTED.

[R]-> We regret to inform you that your submission [*NUMBER*] ([*TITLE*]) has NOT been accepted.

The Call for Music was extremely successful: we received 77 submissions for the Music Program, and were able to accept only 17 for the three planned concerts. The Music Program Chairs and the Curators have worked to put together a high-quality and balanced program for each concert.

[A]-> Below you can find the concert for which your contribution has been selected. During the next weeks you will receive all details about concert dates, rehearsals, etc.

Please note

At least one among the composer(s) and the performer(s) provided by the composer must register to the conference before May 31st, 2011. Failure to have at least one such registration will result in removal of your work from the Music Program.

[R]-> We hope that SMC2011 will be a great event for the Sound and Music Computing community. We therefore encourage you to take part to this event anyway, and give your personal contribution to its success.

The online registration form and related instructions are available at <http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org/registration.htm>

We are looking forward to seeing you in Padova in July.

Best regards,

Nicola Bernardini, Alvise Vidolin, Paolo Zavagna (Music Program Chairs)

A.13 Sponsorship request

Dear Sirs,

hereby I am sending the program of the International Conference: SOUND AND MUSIC COMPUTING (SMC2011) "CREATIVITY RETHINKS SCIENCE", which will be held in Padova, Italy, on July 2 to 9 2011. This annual conference is a unique gathering place for top researchers around the world in the field of Sound and Music Computing.

This edition is jointly organized by the Department of Information Engineering of the University of Padova, and by the Conservatory "Cesare Pollini" of Padova, and is also an occasion to disseminate the first results of the SaMPL (Sound and Music Processing Lab), a new joint multidisciplinary laboratory born from the collaboration between the University and the Conservatory. SaMPL aims at being an unconventional creative environments, where research and art collaborate in a productive way injecting new ideas and concepts in both fields.

... [Personalized teaser targeted at the specific company addressed] ...

I would like to extend an invitation to [Company] to participate in this event. We are looking for a contribution of [amount] and for this we would ensure that you have ample visibility on the conference website (<http://smc2011.smcnetwork.org>) and on all printed material (leaflets, programs, proceedings, etc.), as well as the possibility to include brochures or informative material in the conference participant kits. We will provide you with two free passes for the conference, to invite guests of your choice be it colleagues or clients.

I am sure that your participation will help promote your business to approximately 200 conference attendees, and to the international Sound and Music Computing community at large in the academia and industry.

The scientific program will focus on such themes as sound processing and synthesis, multimodal human- computer interaction and virtual reality, sound design, preservation and modeling of music heritage, sound and music information retrieval, musical social networks. The conference will also include a music program with four concerts, and a 5-days Summer School with about 20 selected PhD students and young researchers. More information about the event can be found in the enclosed preliminary program.

I am looking forward to your participation in SMC2011.

Kindest regards

Federico Avanzini

SMC2011 General Chair

B Documents

B.1 Guidelines for reviewers

Guidelines for reviewers

Federico Avanzini, Davide Rocchesso, Giovanni De Poli

1. TECHNICAL GUIDELINES

1.1. Scheduling

As soon as you are notified of your assigned paper, please check all of them to make sure that

- (a) there is no obvious conflict of interest (see Conflicts of Interest below)
- (b) the number of assigned papers and the deadline allow you enough time to complete your reviews (see Commitment and Respect below);
- (c) you are qualified to review the papers assigned;
- (d) none of the papers assigned to you violates any of the paper submission guidelines.

If any issues arise regarding these points, notify them immediately to the Technical Program Committee.

You should schedule in advance your review work, and not leave it for the last few days near the deadline. Adhering to the deadline is essential, since the Technical Program Committee and Chairs still have a huge amount of work to do after the review process has been completed.

It is advisable to read papers well in advance before the deadline, in order to have time to think about them over a sufficiently long timespan before writing your reviews. This is essential in order for you to make thoughtful decisions about your assigned papers, and to provide helpful suggestions for the authors.

1.2. Evaluation criteria

Your evaluation of the papers assigned to you should be based upon the following criteria:

- (a) originality – understood both as the exercise of independent critical thinking in defining novel problems/approaches, and as the amount of superpositions with previously published material;
- (b) significance of the contribution to the field – assessing the amount of material suitable for publication, and the significance of the paper in contributing to knowledge or understanding in the area with which it deals;
- (c) quality of research – understood as technical correctness of the work in terms of scientific methodologies and assessment of results;
- (d) quality of writing – encompassing all aspects related to quality of the literary presentation, from the overall organization of material, to usage of symbols, terms, and concepts, down to spelling, grammatical and typing errors;
- (e) contribution to the conference program – understood as the amount of matching of the topic of the paper with those of the conference, irrespectively of its overall quality.

Keep in mind that minor flaws can be corrected, and should not be a reason to reject a paper. However, accepted papers have to be technically sound and make an original and substantial contribution to the field, also in relation with the topics of the conference: please familiarize yourself with the information in the Call for Participation and the Conference Topics.

When deciding your recommendation for a paper, do not be shy. Use the whole spectrum of evaluation

scores: if you think a paper is outstanding, give it the highest score and no less than that. Similarly, if you think a paper is really bad (and can convincingly support your opinion), then give it the lowest score and no more than that.

Very often reviewers tend to use intermediate scores, because they are not entirely confident on their judgement, and/or because they did not have time to read their papers thoroughly. This attitude causes really good papers not to stand out, and very bad papers not to be “caught”.

Ensure that your scores are consistent with your comments to the authors. In particular, receiving good comments and a poor score is frustrating, and often causes the authors to request clarifications or rebuttals.

1.3. Comments for the authors

Your comments for the authors are probably the most important part of your reviews.

They will be returned to the authors, so you should include any specific feedback which helps improve the papers. Thorough comments also help the Technical Program Committee decide which papers to accept, sometimes more than your score.

Remember that your reviews are evaluated by the Technical Program Committee. Moreover, after the completion of the review process, they will be available to other reviewers of the same papers. Therefore your good work will help generating a positive trend in the research community.

Short reviews are not helpful to either the authors and the Technical Program Committee.

Please be as specific and detailed as you can. When discussing related work and references, simply saying “this is well known” or “this has been common practice for years” is not appropriate. You should cite publications, or other public disclosures of techniques, which can support your statements.

Be specific also when you suggest improvements in the writing. If there is a particular passage in the text that is unclear, point it out and give suggestions for improvements.

Be generous about providing new ideas for improvement. You may suggest different techniques or tools to be used in the applications presented in a paper. You may also suggest the authors a new application area that might benefit from their work. You may suggest them a generalization of their concept, which they have not considered.

If you think that the paper has merits but does not match the topics of the SMC conference, please say so and suggest alternative publication options that are more appropriate in your opinion (journals, conferences, workshops).

2. ETHICAL GUIDELINES

2.1. Commitment and respect

Remember that academic careers and reputations rely on scientific publications. Therefore you have to be seriously committed to your work as a reviewer.

In the past there have been complaints about some reviews being too sketchy and superficial, so that it looked like the reviewer did not take the time to read the paper carefully.

A sketchy or casual review is a lack of respect to the authors who have seriously submitted their paper, and in the long run is a damage to the SMC conference. If you have agreed to review a paper, you should devote enough time to write a thoughtful and detailed review. If you think you cannot review properly your assigned papers because you are too busy, you should not commit to your assignment.

Keep in mind that belittling or sarcastic comments are not appropriate. Even if you think that a paper is really bad, you should be constructive and still provide feedback to the authors. If you give a paper a low score, it is essential that you justify the reason for that score in detail. Just saying “I do not like this approach because I am a guru in this area” is not constructive.

Also keep in mind that directly talking about the authors can be sometimes perceived as being confrontational, even though you do not mean it this way. For this reason, you may want to avoid



referring to the authors by using the phrase “you” or “the authors”, and use instead “the paper”.

2.2. Confidentiality and anonymity

As a reviewer you have the responsibility to protect the confidentiality of the ideas represented in the papers you review. Submissions to the SMC conference have not (or should not have) been published before.

Although the authors' ultimate goal is to publish and disseminate their work, a percentage of submitted papers will not be accepted and published in the SMC conference proceedings, and will most likely be submitted to some other journal or conference. Sometimes a submitted paper is still considered confidential by the author's employers or funding sources.

In order to comply with confidentiality requirements,

- (a) you should not show your assigned papers (or their accompanying material) to anyone else, including colleagues or students, unless you have asked them to help with your review;
- (b) you should not use ideas from your assigned papers to develop new ones;
- (c) after completing your reviews you should destroy all copies of your assigned papers and accompanying material, and erase any implementations you may have written and results you may have obtained to evaluate the ideas in the papers.

Although some reviewers like to disclose their identity to authors, it is advisable not to do so.

One of the most common ways of inadvertently disclosing your identity is asking the authors to cite your past work and several of your own papers. This should be avoided. Besides, this attitude may have a negative effect on your review: it may be seen as if you just want to gain more citations, and may ultimately result in the authors just ignoring your review (and possibly the Technical Program Committee too).

2.3. Conflicts of interest

Even though you would judge impartially any paper assigned to you, there has to be no doubt about the impartiality of your reviews. Therefore, if there is a potential conflict of interest with one of your assigned papers, you should inform the Technical Program Committee.

Although in general you should use your judgment, examples of situations of potential conflicts of interest are the following:

- (a) you work in the same research group as one of the authors;
- (b) you have been involved in the work and will be credited in some way (e.g. you have hosted one of the authors in your lab, to carry out work related to the paper);
- (c) you have formally collaborated (e.g., written a paper together, or been awarded a joint grant) with one of the authors in the past three years (more or less);
- (d) you were the MS/PhD advisor (or advisee) of one of the authors: this is often considered to be a lifetime conflict of interest;
- (e) you have reasons to believe that others might see a conflict of interest, even though there is none (e.g., you and one of the authors work for the same multinational corporation, although you work in different departments on different continents and have never met before).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document is partially based on the reviewers' guidelines of the CVPR2010 and SIGGRAPH2008 conferences:

- http://cvl.umiacs.umd.edu/conferences/cvpr2010/review/reviewer_guidelines.html
- <http://www.siggraph.org/s2008/submissions/juried/papers/instructions.php>



B.2 Review form

SMC2011 (chair)[Help](#) [Sign out](#)[Submissions](#) [Reviews](#) [Status](#) [View Bids](#) [Assignment](#) [PC](#) [Events](#) [Email](#) [Administration](#) [SMC20](#)**Add New Review on SMC2011 Submission
79**[Add associate as a subreviewer](#)

To ensure independent and unbiased reviews, EasyChair does not show reviews of other PC members to a PC member who is assigned this paper but did not enter his review yet. As a consequence of this policy, if you enter a review and then revise it so that the score changes, the system will show both the original and the revised reviews.

For this reason, please **ensure that the first review you enter for the paper is a valid review and not a draft and that the scores you give to the paper are the intended scores**. If you revise a review and change the scores, we recommend to add a note for PC members explaining the reason for changing the scores.

Paper and reviewer information

Title:	Active preservation of electrophone musical instruments. The case of the "Liettizzatore" of "Studio di Fonologia Musicale" (RAI, Milano)
Category:	Poster
Authors:	Sergio Canazza, Antonio Roda', Maddalena Novati and Federico Avanzini
PC member:	Federico Avanzini
<i>Click on "Add associate as a subreviewer" in the top right corner to add your associate as a subreviewer.</i>	
Subreviewer name[†]: (leave empty if reviewed by yourself)	<input type="text"/>
Last name:	<input type="text"/>
Email address:	<input type="text"/>

[†] Note: leave first name blank if there is no first name. If you are not sure how to divide a name into the first and last name, [read the Help article about names](#).

Evaluation

Overall evaluation	Reviewer's confidence
<input type="radio"/> 3 strong accept	<input type="radio"/> 4 expert
<input type="radio"/> 2 accept	<input type="radio"/> 3 high
<input type="radio"/> 1 weak accept	<input type="radio"/> 2 medium
<input type="radio"/> 0 borderline paper	<input type="radio"/> 1 low
<input type="radio"/> -1 weak reject	<input type="radio"/> 0 null
<input type="radio"/> -2 reject	
<input type="radio"/> -3 strong reject	

Additional scores

Originality	<input type="radio"/> 5 (totally novel problem/approach) <input type="radio"/> 4 (original problem/approach) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3 (some innovative aspects) <input type="radio"/> 2 (mostly not original) <input type="radio"/> 1 (not original at all)
Significance of the contribution to the field	<input type="radio"/> 5 (landmark paper) <input type="radio"/> 4 (high significance) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3 (some relevant aspects) <input type="radio"/> 2 (low significance) <input type="radio"/> 1 (null significance)
Quality of research	<input type="radio"/> 5 (rock solid) <input type="radio"/> 4 (correct) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3 (reasonable) <input type="radio"/> 2 (minor flaws) <input type="radio"/> 1 (major flaws)
Quality of writing	<input type="radio"/> 5 (crystal clear) <input type="radio"/> 4 (satisfactory) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3 (minor problems) <input type="radio"/> 2 (poor writing) <input type="radio"/> 1 (incomprehensible text)
Contribution to the conference program	<input type="radio"/> 5 (excellent match) <input type="radio"/> 4 (good match) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3 (fair match) <input type="radio"/> 2 (weak match) <input type="radio"/> 1 (poor match)
Suggested format	<input type="radio"/> 2 (oral presentation) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 (poster)
Candidate for best paper award	<input type="radio"/> 2 (Yes) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 (No)

Review

Review. Please provide a detailed review, including justification for your scores. This review **will be sent** to the PC chairs if they decide not to do so. This field is required unless you have an attachment.

Comments for the author(s)

(Your comments should also explain the scores you gave in the evaluation criteria)

Attachment. If your review is in a non-text format, for example, a PDF file, upload it here:

Confidential remarks for the Programme Committee. If you wish to add any remarks intended only for the Programme Committee, write them below. These remarks will only be seen by the programme committee members having access to this submission. They **will not be sent to the authors**. This field is optional.

Submit review

B.3 Feedback from TPC, reviewers and participants

Comments by TPC members/reviewers after the review process, in response to our request for feedback

Dear Federico,

I managed to finish the review by DL last Friday. During the upload process I could see the other reviews so far sent to the system, including names of the reviewers. Also, during the weekend I received emails of reviews by other reviewers, again with names. This seems to be a bit different than in a typical review process. In the IEEE system the reviews are transparent to the other reviewers, but the names are withheld. Was the visibility of the names of the reviewers a system feature?

Good luck with the upcoming SMC conference!

Best wishes,
Henri [Penttinen]

Dear SMCers,

I'd say your decision to use paper bidding helped a lot to get good quality reviews: One could be sure to review articles one is interested in/knowledgable about.

A dopo in Padova...

...Diemo [Schwarz]

Never had such a smooth review process and, for our papers, such a high-quality review...

Looking forward to seeing you guys!

-kjetil [Falkenberg Hansen]

Comments by members of SMC Steering Committee who attended the conference

Dear all,

This is a short report for both the conference and the steering committee meeting.

First of all, I wish to renew my congratulations to Federico, Giovanni and to all the people and students involved in the organisation of this year SMC. It was a very successful edition, interesting, of very good quality, in a beautiful and impressive place, where you can feel the sense of culture and history.

The conference took place in an atmosphere both friendly and hardworking. The coffee served during the coffee breaks was real italian coffee, distilled by real italian experts :-)... Well, and to make short, I'll keep a very good memory of the conference.

My feeling is that the conference is improving year after year. Of course, there is still room for further improvements but I think it has reached a good level of quality and it has its own and unique 'personality' (although not specialized). The attendance seems to be more and more international, I mean there are more and more countries represented: Japan, Brasil, Canada, India... (among others and in addition to the european countries). However, this is not a reason to rest (not yet). On the contrary, it looks like an invitation to refine our models of experience transmission from organizer to organizer, our process of papers selection and our communication way.

I'm curious to get the analysis of the 'meta-reviewing' process. In parallel, there is also this post-evaluation process that is running i.e. the evaluation of the 'goodness-of-fit' of the selected papers by the chairmans. I was among them and I'll send my comments quickly.

You'll find the meeting report below.

Best regards,

--

Dominique

[... meeting report ...]

Dear all,

I would like also to transmit my experience at SMC11, Padova.

I would like to congratulate Federico Avanzini and his team for the excellent organization in all terms and the wonderful Italian FILOXENIA (hospitality):

1. The buffet during the posters was a wonderful idea
2. The quality of concerts was of a high level
3. The themes of the conference as augmented learning, music heritage and creativity have introduced a most creative dialogue between composers, educators, musicologists and computer science researchers.
4. The key note speaker has initiated a new area of discussion in the terms of philosophy of sound and new media in music, or esthetics of application of new technologies in music creation, production, education and diffusing.

[...unrelated content...]

Anastasia

--

Georgaki Anastasia

Assistant Professor,

Department of Music studies,

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

E-mails sent by participants after the conference, in response to our request for feedback

Hi Federico + SMC2010 staff,

Thanks once more for the huge effort well done in organizing the SMC-2011 event. Please find my feedback below.

positive

- no problems with the paper templates
- submission was smooth
- the review quality was the best I've received this year (comparing to DAFx and ICMC)
- no problems in registration
- the info desk people were very helpful
- the venue was prestigious, and the technical things worked as well
- diverse technical program, I'm sure it will spark new ideas (actually, it did so already)
- the proceedings pdf looks professional
- it was great to meet old friends, and to make new contacts
- the trip to Venice was a great experience, one to remember for many years to come
- the weather wasn't too bad at all

negative

- the poster space was a bit jammed, it would have been nice if the posters could have been arranged more sparsely as there was free space in the coffee/lunch room. Also one table per poster might have been useful.
- A matter of musical taste probably, but I did not enjoy the concerts very much. The laptop orchestra performance was the most interesting one.

Best Regards,
Jari [Kleimola]

Dear Organizers,

Apologies for the delayed response to your request for feedback. I was travelling for some time. In my opinion, the conference could not have been better organized! The venue and arrangements were superlative. The program was good. I really liked the "poster craze" idea (that I came across for the first time). Your hospitality at the lunches and tea was a very pleasant surprise considering my experience at other (larger) conferences in different countries. I could not attend all the concerts. I appreciated the trouble taken by the organisers to arrange the nice post-conference tour of Venice.

Thank you.

Best wishes

Preeti Rao

Department of Electrical Engg.,

Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay,

Powai, Mumbai 400 076

Phone: +91-22-2576 7695, 8695

Dear Federico,

Many thanks once more for a fascinating few days - the photos helped to jog a few memories even after this short time!

I must say that I was very impressed with the balance of papers and the timetabling of each day - there was always time to soak up the contents of each presentation and get in touch with the author(s) during the coffee breaks. The poster craze sessions worked extremely well, affording everyone the opportunity to get their work across to the broad audience.

It was a great pleasure to visit the conference and present - it will be a great many weeks before every detail in my SMC2011 notebook is attended to, not to mention every contact followed up!

Kind regards,

Patrick McGlynn

Music Technology Laboratory,
NUI Maynooth,
Co. Kildare,
Ireland

Hi,

This was my first time attending SMC and I found it to be a very engaging conference. The organizers did a tremendous job, everything went very smoothly and the conference venue itself could not have been more perfect. The only criticism I can muster is that the posters were close together and it was hard to talk to the presenters in the large crowd that formed around each poster. Congratulations on a very successful SMC 2011!

Best,

Jeff

=====

Jeffrey Scott
Research Assistant
MET-Lab * Drexel University
<http://music.ece.drexel.edu>

Ciao Federico,
bravo e bravi!!! (molto positive comment ;-)
Ho l'impressione che SMC stia diventando sempre piu' interessante e pregnante (anche in senso inglese di pregnant... di idee).
Credo che il carattere multidisciplinare a largo raggio sia l'aspetto caratterizzante vincente.

ciao e buone vacanze!

[English summary]

I have the feeling that SMC is becoming more and more interesting and rich of contents/ideas.

I believe that the wide-range multidisciplinary character is the most valuable distinguishing aspect of the conference.

Pietro [Polotti]

Dear organizers!

Thank you very much for the very pleasant conference experience. It was actually the best conference ever I have experienced. Both the technical and artistic programs were very satisfying with high quality, and social program was comfortable and enjoyable! Any of the problems I encountered before and during the conference (starting from deadline extension, microsoft word problem in the manuscript preparation, finding a pharmacy in Padova...) was elegantly rescued by the fantastic team of the conference-life-savers! Every virtue was enhanced by good food and hospitality that I experienced everywhere in Padova, not only in the conference. I believe every SMC participant shares this view with me!

Best regards,
- hiroko

--

Hiroko Terasawa
<http://www.tara.tsukuba.ac.jp/~terasawa/>

Hi, Federico

I have attended perhaps two dozen computer music conferences in the past five years, and I feel that the music at this year's SMC was the most enjoyable I have yet experienced! Congratulations.

In particular, I appreciate that varied focus between the concerts, allowing the "grand masters" a concert, as well as the "new experimentalists" and a laptop concert. The curating seemed to create a successful cohesion to each concert.

Having the last concert in Venice, combined with the social activity of simply being there, was a much appreciated decision. It was memorable not only for the music, but, obviously, the location.

The single paper track was, as always, appreciated. The location of the paper presentations was spectacular.

The food was excellent during the conference.

Lastly, the technical support during the conference, particularly during the concerts, was impressive.

All in all, this was one of the most successful and memorable conferences I have attended in recent years. You have set the bar very high for future SMC events!

Dr. Arne Eigenfeldt
Associate Professor, Music and Technology
School for the Contemporary Arts
Associate Member,
School of Interactive Arts and Technology
Simon Fraser University

Dear Federico,

I think the papers were of varied qualities, as one would expect, with several very good ones. However, after having attended international conferences for some 18 years, this has been probably the most rigorously prepared, with much of interest to take away. The wide range of topics and openness to them was greatly appreciated. I enjoyed the music that I heard, but could not attend all the concerts (nor the entire conference, for that matter, unfortunately). So, the most important thing I can communicate to you is to congratulate you and your organising committee on a really terrific conference.

[...unrelated content...]

All the best,
Emery [Schubert]

thanks, i enjoyed very much coming to padua! good organisation!

best, hanns holger rutz

Interdisciplinary Centre for Computer Music Research (ICCMR)
University of Plymouth
Smeaton 206
Drake Circus
Plymouth PL4 8AA
Tel: +44 (0)1752 232579