

Issue Date: Oct.16 2026

Paper Acceptance Letter

2026 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM 2026)

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to confirm that the following paper:

Paper ID: S41204
Title: “Evidence-Audited Mining of Urban Transit Accessibility Proxies: A Versioned Shanghai Metro Study”

is accepted by UIM3 2026 / IEEE ICDM 2026 Workshops.

ICDM 2026 will take place in Shenyang, China, from November 12-15, 2026. ICDM has established itself as the world's premier research conference in data mining. The conference covers all aspects of data mining, including algorithms, software, systems, and applications. It draws researchers, application developers, and practitioners from a wide range of data mining-related areas, such as big data, deep learning, pattern recognition, statistical and machine learning, databases, data warehousing, data visualization, knowledge-based systems, high-performance computing, and large models.

Should you have any inquiries, please contact our Conference Secretariat: icdm2026@iccmacao.com
Sincerely,

Jian Xu

Local Chair, ICDM 2026

Professor, Northeastern University, China

Gmail **Hongxin Su <hongxinsue@gmail.com>**

UIM3 2026 Submission: S41204

icdmws-inform@wi-lab.com <icdmws-inform@wi-lab.com> 2026年9月24日 14:22
回复：mostafa.ameli@univ-eiffel.fr
收件人：suiyuan_melody@foxmail.com, hongxinsue@gmail.com

Dear Hongxin Su and Yuan Sui,

Once again, congratulations to your paper (S41204),
entitled

"Evidence-Audited Mining of Urban Transit Accessibility Proxies: A Versioned Shanghai Metro Study"

Enclosed at the bottom of this message, please find
the review report for your paper.
Papers went through a rigorous review process.
Each paper was reviewed by at least two program committee members.
Please carefully take into account the enclosed comments by
the reviewers, and submit your paper by **September 29, 2006**.
Please do not forget to register at the same time.
Thank you for patience.

Best Wishes,

Program Chair

==========

--========= Review Reports =========--

The review report from reviewer #1:

*1: Is the paper relevant to Workshop?
[_] No
[X] Yes

*2: How innovative is the paper?
[_] 6 (Very innovative)
[X] 3 (Innovative)
[_] -2 (Marginally)
[_] -4 (Not very much)
[_] -6 (Not at all)

*3: How would you rate the technical quality of the paper?
[_] 6 (Very high)
[X] 3 (High)
[_] -2 (Marginal)
[_] -4 (Low)
[_] -6 (Very low)

*4: How is the presentation?
[_] 6 (Excellent)
[X] 3 (Good)
[_] -2 (Marginal)
[_] -4 (Below average)
[_] -6 (Poor)

*5: Is the paper of interest to Workshop users and practitioners?
[X] 3 (Yes)
[_] 2 (May be)
[_] 1 (No)

[_] 0 (Not applicable)

*6: What is your confidence in your review of this paper?
[X] 2 (High)
[_] 1 (Medium)
[_] 0 (Low)

*7: Overall recommendation
[_] 5 (Strong Accept: top quality)
[X] 4 (Accept: a regular paper)
[_] 3 (Weak Accept: could be a poster)
[_] 2 (Weak Reject: don't like it, but won't argue to reject it)
[_] 1 (Reject: will argue to reject it)
[_] 0 (Strong Reject: hopeless)

*8: Detailed comments for the authors
The paper proposes an evidence-audited workflow to study how missing data, entity definitions, score rules, source versions, and tie handling affect transit accessibility proxies. The Shanghai Metro case is carefully designed, and the distinction between missing evidence and observed low accessibility is particularly useful. However, the contribution is mainly methodological auditing rather than a new accessibility model, and several points could be clarified.

1- The novelty should be positioned more clearly. Data provenance and reproducibility are already established topics in urban analytics. The contribution here seems to be their systematic integration with missing-evidence stress testing and fixed-capacity accessibility-proxy selection. Please emphasize this distinction.

2- The underlying score is inherited and not validated against wheelchair-user experience, expert audits, or observed trip feasibility. The paper acknowledges this limitation. However, how transferable are the conclusions about ranking stability when the score itself has unknown construct validity?

2- Recent Shanghai studies directly evaluate wheelchair accessibility using route feasibility, delay factors, or barrier-free facility assessments. For example, Yang et al. (2025) estimate wheelchair transit accessibility and delay factors, while other recent work evaluates barrier-free metro accessibility using user and facility information. Please clarify more explicitly how the proposed upstream audit complements these accessibility-assessment approaches.

3- The missingness experiments use independent, district-correlated, line-correlated, and facility-type-correlated synthetic losses. These are useful stress tests, but they do not represent an identified real missing-data mechanism. How sensitive is the conclusions to other plausible missingness processes?

4- The comparison with the official-source capture is not an external validation because both representations appear to come from the same source family. The paper acknowledges this. I suggest describing the result consistently as cross-representation stability, rather than evidence of accuracy.
The experimental universe contains 388 reconstructed objects, while the municipal source reports 508 metro stations. Could the missing part of the network systematically differ from the reconstructed sample?

5- The paper compares zero-fill, several median approaches, and abstention, which is a useful internal benchmark. However, there is no external benchmark against a validated accessibility index or ground-truth accessibility labels. This is acceptable for an audit paper, but the distinction between output stability and accessibility accuracy should remain very explicit throughout.

==========
The review report from reviewer #2:

*1: Is the paper relevant to Workshop?
[_] No
[X] Yes

*2: How innovative is the paper?
[_] 6 (Very innovative)
[X] 3 (Innovative)
[_] -2 (Marginally)
[_] -4 (Not very much)
[_] -6 (Not at all)

*3: How would you rate the technical quality of the paper?
[_] 6 (Very high)
[_] 3 (High)
[X] -2 (Marginal)
[_] -4 (Low)
[_] -6 (Very low)

*4: How is the presentation?
[_] 6 (Excellent)
[_] 3 (Good)
[X] -2 (Marginal)
[_] -4 (Below average)
[_] -6 (Poor)

*5: Is the paper of interest to Workshop users and practitioners?
[_] 3 (Yes)
[X] 2 (May be)
[_] 1 (No)
[_] 0 (Not applicable)

*6: What is your confidence in your review of this paper?
[X] 2 (High)
[_] 1 (Medium)
[_] 0 (Low)

*7: Overall recommendation
[_] 5 (Strong Accept: top quality)
[_] 4 (Accept: a regular paper)
[_] 3 (Weak Accept: could be a poster)
[_] 2 (Weak Reject: don't like it, but won't argue to reject it)
[X] 1 (Reject: will argue to reject it)
[_] 0 (Strong Reject: hopeless)

*8: Detailed comments for the authors
The paper aims to audit how methodological choices—such as entity definitions, missing-evidence rules, source-record loss, frozen representation choices, and tie-handling rules—affect the resulting accessibility scores and rankings derived from heterogeneous facility data.

While the topic is interesting and relevant, several issues should be addressed by the authors. The main concern relates to the evaluation. The underlying accessibility score is not validated against actual wheelchair-user reports, expert accessibility audits, or observed trip feasibility. As a result, it remains an inherited application-level proxy whose ability to reflect real-world accessibility has not been demonstrated. This significantly limits the interpretation of the results and the conclusions that can be drawn from the proposed audit.

The methodological contribution should also be strengthened and clarified. The paper essentially provides an audit and stress test of an existing scoring rule rather than introducing a new spatial statistic, imputation method, entity-resolution approach, or accessibility modeling framework. In its current form, the methodological novelty therefore appears limited. For ICDMW, the authors should more clearly articulate the methodological contribution and strengthen it beyond the systematic assessment of an inherited scoring procedure.

==========

This email address is for sending only. Replies to this email will not be received.