# Message from the USENIX ATC '25 Program Co-Chairs

## Introduction

We are thrilled and honored to be holding the all-time largest USENIX ATC program, which, unfortunately, will also be ATC's last. The joint USENIX ATC and OSDI conference brings together top academic researchers, industry practitioners, and newcomers in the field; we are looking forward to meeting with you all and to many great discussions during the conference. For many of us in the community, USENIX ATC has been the conference that best captured a balance between academic depth and production pragmatism, and between deep technical advances and creative new ideas. We hope the work in this year's program reflects that legacy.

The rest of this document provides some insights into the submission and selection process that culminated in the 100 accepted works that will be presented at the conference.

## Submission Process

As in the recent past, USENIX ATC '25 solicited three types of papers: full-length 12-page research papers, short 6-page research papers that describe complete and well-evaluated ideas using fewer pages, and full-length "Deployed Systems" papers. The Deployed Systems submissions align with the USENIX mission of bringing together researchers in academia and systems practitioners. These papers had different criteria for acceptance from research papers; they were judged more carefully on their practical insights rather than on their new ideas.

In addition to the submission, authors were asked to provide optional supplementary materials, a description of changes that had been made to the submission since prior submissions, and, for Deployed Systems submissions, a justification for why the submission was appropriate for that track.

## Program Committee Selection Process

Our program committee (PC) was assembled to meet several competing goals like past USENIX ATC PCs: good coverage across diverse computer-systems topics, balance between academia and industry, a mix of veterans of prior USENIX ATC PCs with individuals in early stages of their professional careers, geographic diversity, and adherence to the USENIX diversity and inclusion principles.

The assembled PC had:

- 172 members from 20 countries.
- Geographic distribution of 67% from North America, 11% from EMEA and 22% from APAC.
- 73% of members from academia and 27% from industry.
- 61% veteran members who served USENIX ATC at least once in the past 3 years.
- 15% female representation, similar to the 14% at USENIX ATC '24.
- And primary areas of expertise from Distributed Systems (19%), Operating Systems (19%), Storage (15%), AI/Machine Learning (14%), Cloud (10%), Security (8%), and Networking (7%).

For the PC selection process, we initially drew from a pool of experienced PC members who had served at least once in the prior 3 iterations of USENIX ATC, removing those who were concurrently serving for OSDI. We prioritized several factors in sending invitations, including: reviewers flagged as producing good reviews for previous conferences; recommendations from invitees who were unable to serve; topic matches to anticipate the need for Machine Learning expertise; and female representation. For the cases in which we needed expertise for a paper where all reviewers identified low levels of expertise, we solicited recommendations from the PC and invited external reviewers.

## Review Process

USENIX ATC '25 received 634 submissions across all tracks, which was a 30% increase over USENIX ATC '24 and an 80% increase over USENIX ATC '23. Of these, 32 (5%) were deployed systems papers and 56 (9%) were short papers. The most popular topics for submissions, as specified by authors were: systems and machine learning (37% of submissions), parallel and distributed systems (26%), storage (22%), cloud computing (20%), networking (16%), and operating systems (14%).

We retained USENIX ATC's double-blind review process to minimize bias with strict anonymity rules. Eight papers were

ultimately rejected due to violations of these rules. We rejected six other submissions without review due to violations of the formatting guidelines.

To increase the quality and relevance of reviews, we ran a bidding process where PC members had 3 days to bid on papers within their expertise. USENIX ATC '25 had two double-blind rounds of reviews.

- **Round 1:** The goal was to identify early rejections and papers where reviewers lacked expertise. We assigned 3 reviewers per paper, resulting in 1857 round 1 review assignments. We notified authors of the 345 papers rejected in round 1 (56%) early to give them more time for preparing future submissions of their work.
- **Round 2:** We assigned at least two additional reviewers to the 274 remaining submissions, bringing the total to 5 reviews for each of these papers.
- **Author Response Period:** After the second review period and an online discussion period the reviews were made available for authors to respond to. Authors had 3 days to write a response. The reviewers then continued asynchronous online discussion for another 2 weeks.
- **PC Meeting:** 92 papers were pre-accepted, leaving 27 papers for discussion at the synchronous virtual PC meeting, of which 8 (30%) were accepted. The PC meeting was one day, and it provided a high-bandwidth channel to resolve discussions and select the final program.

The PC selected 100 papers for a 16% acceptance rate. Of these, 6 were deployed systems papers, 7 were short, and 87 were full-length research papers. After selecting the program, the program chairs selected the best paper awards based on nominations from the PC.

**Artifact Evaluation Process**

USENIX ATC '25 continued to run a joint artifact evaluation process with OSDI '25. The authors of all accepted papers were invited to submit an artifact for an evaluation, and 47 out of the 100 USENIX ATC papers did so.

- 98% of artifacts received an "Available" badge.
- 94% received a "Functional" badge.
- 77% received a "Reproduced" badge.
- 77% of papers received all three badges.

**Acknowledgements**

Putting on a conference of USENIX ATC's scale is a massive task that requires the help of hundreds of individuals, most of whom are volunteers. First, we thank our Program Committee who bore the spike in submissions, wrote detailed reviews, and argued for papers both online and at the Program Committee Meeting. We also deeply appreciate the Artifact Evaluation chairs and the numerous participants on the Artifact Evaluation Committee that helped to evaluate submissions' software artifacts; this work is crucial for ensuring accountability and reproducibility in our field. Next, as always, the USENIX staff along with the USENIX ATC Steering Committee were instrumental in every step of the process. They were quick to help us when we needed it, and they kept everything organized and moving forward. Finally, we want to express our deep gratitude to the authors, whose incredible work is the bedrock of a great conference; we hope that everyone that submitted to USENIX ATC benefitted from the process.

Thank you to all of the authors and to everyone who has helped make USENIX ATC what it has been over the years—a premier venue where systems research is both principled and grounded in reality. If this is indeed the last USENIX ATC, we hope it's a fitting one.

Deniz Altınbüken, *Google DeepMind*
Ryan Stutsman, *University of Utah*
USENIX ATC '25 Program Co-Chairs