

Has ACL Lost Its Crown? A Decade-Long Quantitative Analysis of Scale and Impact Across Leading AI Conferences

Jianglin Ma¹, Ben Yao³, Xiang Li^{1*}, Yazhou Zhang^{2*}

¹ Shandong Computer Science Center (National Supercomputer Center in Jinan),

²Tianjin University

³The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Correspondence: yzhou_zhang@tju.edu.cn; lixiang@qlu.edu.cn

Abstract

The recent surge of language models (LMs) has rapidly expanded NLP/AI research, driving an exponential rise in submissions and acceptances at major conferences. Yet this growth has been shadowed by escalating concerns over conference quality, e.g., plagiarism, reviewer inexperience and collusive bidding. However, existing studies rely largely on qualitative accounts (e.g., expert interviews, social media discussions, etc.), lacking longitudinal empirical evidence. To fill this gap, we conduct a ten-year empirical study (2014–2024) spanning seven leading conferences. We build a four-dimensional bibliometric framework covering conference scale, core citation statistics, impact dispersion, cross-venue and journal influence, etc. Notably, we further propose a metric *Quality–Quantity Elasticity* (QQE), which measures the elasticity of citation growth relative to acceptance growth. Our findings show that ML venues sustain dominant and stable impact, NLP venues undergo widening stratification with mixed expansion efficiency, and AI venues exhibit structural decline. This study provides the first decade-long, cross-venue empirical evidence on the evolution of major NLP/AI conferences¹.

1 Introduction

The rapid evolution of language modeling, progressing from neural language models to large language models (LLMs), has brought NLP research to global prominence and substantially increased both the size of the research community and the academic weight of conference publications (Naveed et al., 2025). Consequently, submissions and acceptances at major NLP and AI conferences have risen exponentially. For example, the ACL main conference grew from 692 long-paper submissions and 173 acceptances in 2015 to 4,407 submissions and

¹All code and processed datasets will be released upon publication to ensure full reproducibility.




Figure 1: Annual submissions and acceptances across major NLP/AI conferences from 2014 to 2024.

865 acceptances in 2024, with an increase of 536% and 400%, respectively (Ku et al., 2024). Similar trajectories are observed in EMNLP, AAAI, NeurIPS, and others, as shown in Fig. 1. While this large-scale expansion reflects the vitality of NLP research, it also raises new challenges for academic governance and quality control.

While this expansion reflects the vitality of the NLP research, it also introduces new challenges for academic governance and quality assurance. Recent years have seen increasing reports of plagiarism, excessive emphasis on storytelling over science. At the same time, the peer-review system shows signs of strain, including collusive bidding, reviewer overload and the rising involvement of inexperienced or insufficiently trained reviewers. Well-known controversies, such as the “Who’s Adam?”², the AAAI bid-group coordination incident³, and the community’s satirical nickname for ICLR (*I Can pay the biLl foR you*)⁴, have further amplified skepticism toward the fairness and robustness of peer review. An increasing number of researchers are beginning to question whether tradi-

²A NeurIPS 2025 review mistakenly treats the Adam optimizer as a person’s name.

³A private group of authors and reviewers allegedly coordinated their bid selections.

⁴The ICLR incident involving a score-0 review and the author publicly accusing the reviewer of being “mentally ill” and offering to pay for treatment.

tional major conferences still represent the genuine frontier of technical and theoretical progress.

Existing studies approach this issue through two limited perspectives: (1) analytical work on peer-review mechanisms (Rogers and Augenstein, 2020; Wei et al., 2025), and (2) publication-ranking analyses based on citation counts (Croft and Sack, 2022). In addition, qualitative investigations, such as expert interviews, case analyses, and social media discourse⁵ also provide valuable insights. However, they neither conduct longitudinal, cross-venue quantitative analyses nor develop a unified metric for linking scale expansion with shifts in scholarly impact. Consequently, debates on whether top-conference quality is declining remains largely anecdotal and speculative.

To fill this gap, we compile the complete long-paper dataset from seven leading NLP/AI conferences, i.e., ACL, EMNLP, NAACL, AAAI, IJCAI, ICLR and NeurIPS, covering the years 2014 to 2024 and totaling 60,219 long papers. We develop a four-dimensional bibliometric framework comprising: *conference scale* (e.g., annual paper growth rate), *scholarly influence* (e.g., median citations, H-index), *cross-venue/journal citation patterns* (e.g., top-conference citation share) and *Quality–Quantity Elasticity* (QQE), yielding 14 indicators in total. The QQE is proposed to quantify the elasticity of scholarly-impact growth relative to acceptance growth, enabling the detection of potential “inflated prosperity” in conference expansion.

Empirical results show that: (1) ACL maintains stable advantages in median citations and broad cross-venue citation coverage, indicating that its baseline influence within the community remains strong; (2) however, ACL increasingly lags behind ICLR and NeurIPS in the proportion of highly cited papers, citation-growth dynamics, and QQE, revealing its relative weakness in producing high-impact research and converting scale growth into scholarly influence; and (3) time-series analysis reveals a clear decoupling trend in recent years, in which ACL’s scale continues to expand while its relative scholarly impact declines. Our work makes the following main contributions:

- We provide the first ten-year quantitative analysis across seven major NLP/AI conferences.
- We propose *QQE*, an elasticity-based metric

linking acceptance growth to citation-impact growth.

- We analyze ACL as a focal case and identify a clear decoupling between scale expansion and scholarly impact.

2 Related Work

2.1 Bibliometric Studies on Conference Quality

The fundamental role of conferences in computer science was formally emphasized in the 1999 *Best Practices Memo* issued by the U.S. Computing Research Association (CRA), which articulated the importance of conference publications in promotion and tenure evaluation⁶. Since then, conference quality study has become an independent research topic. Evaluations of conference prestige influence researchers’ submission strategies and play a central role in decisions related to funding allocation, project review, faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure (Vrettas and Sanderson, 2015).

Most existing quantitative methods follow journal bibliometrics and rely on citation-based indicators, such as citation counts (Mohammad, 2020), H-index (Zhang, 2011), CiteScore (Meho, 2019), the Y-factor (Hayes and Rohe, 2025), and machine-learning or deep-learning-based prediction models (Iqbal et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2018), etc., to rank conferences. Despite these approaches offer objective comparisons across venues, they rarely examine the long-term evolution of individual conferences, especially in the rapidly expanding and highly volatile NLP/AI landscape.

A second line of work investigates conference mechanisms, focusing on peer-review reliability (Rogers and Augenstein, 2020), the effectiveness of rebuttal (Kuznetsov et al., 2019), and the potential use of AI to improve review quality (Wei et al., 2025). Although such studies highlight institutional challenges in conference governance, they typically lack cross-year and cross-venue analyses. A smaller set of works leverages citation analysis to study interdisciplinary influence (Wahle et al., 2023), or to map research trends and topical evolution within NLP conferences (Michael et al., 2023). These contributions provide valuable but fragmented insights and do not establish a comprehensive framework for assessing whether

⁵<https://yoshuabengio.org/2020/02/26/time-to-rethink-the-publication-process-in-machine-learning/>

⁶<https://cra.org/resources/best-practice-memos>

Conference	No. of Papers	Citations
ACL	4,894	445,025
EMNLP	7,110	627,400
NAACL	2,541	302,823
AAAI	12,795	726,448
IJCAI	6,607	250,999
ICLR	7,645	1,664,624
NeurIPS	18,627	2,251,110
Total	60,219	6,268,429

Table 1: Paper and citation statistics.

conference growth aligns with genuine scholarly impact.

2.2 Expert- and Community-Based Investigation

Expert-based ranking systems constitute another important approach to evaluating conference quality. Such systems solicit evaluations from domain experts to categorize conferences into qualitative tiers. Representative examples include the CORE conference rankings, Microsoft’s Academic Conference Ratings (MSAR), and the CCF recommendation list. Expert judgments leverage domain knowledge and experience to differentiate conferences at a coarse granularity. However, these systems exhibit well-known limitations: they may be influenced by disciplinary bias, regional preferences, local academic politics, and the limited pool of qualified evaluators. Furthermore, they offer limited insight into *intra-tier* differences or the year-to-year evolution of individual conferences.

As major NLP/AI conferences face increasing scrutiny, prominent researchers have voiced concerns about submission policies, peer-review reliability (Russo et al., 2025), and conference culture through blogs, social media, and public commentary⁷. Although such perspectives reflect widespread community anxiety, they remain largely experiential and subjective, and therefore lack the empirical grounding needed to support generalizable conclusions.

To address these gaps, we construct a decade-long, cross-conference bibliometric framework based on all long papers from seven leading NLP/AI conferences (2014–2024), and propose the QQE to quantify the relationship between conference scale growth and scholarly-impact dynamics.

⁷<https://www.reddit.com/r/MachineLearning>

3 Methodology

3.1 Data Acquisition

(1) Venue Selection. To capture the development trajectory of major NLP venues while situating them within the broader AI research ecosystem, we focus on seven widely recognized top-tier conferences: the core NLP venues *ACL*, *EMNLP*, and *NAACL*; and the leading AI venues *AAAI*, *IJCAI*, *NeurIPS*, and *ICLR*.

We restrict our analysis to main-track long papers. Findings papers, short papers, and workshop papers are excluded to ensure cross-year and cross-venue comparability.

(2) Temporal Scope: 2014–2024. Our analysis covers 2014–2024. Since ACL submission volumes were essentially stable from 2009–2014, e.g., 634 (2011), 571 (2012), 664 (2013), and 572 (2014), but began accelerating sharply in 2015 (692), 2014 provides a natural pre-expansion baseline. The year 2024 is chosen as the endpoint to ensure complete and comparable proceedings across all venues⁸.

(3) Data Sources. Because Google Scholar does not provide an official API, partly due to licensing restrictions associated with paywalled publishers, we rely on the following high-quality sources:

- **ACL Anthology:** complete metadata for ACL family conferences.
- **Semantic Scholar:** used as the primary source of citation statistics due to its accuracy and coverage. Notably, 99.3% of all papers are successfully matched through Semantic Scholar.
- **OpenAlex:** used only as a supplemental source to fill missing entries, covering the remaining 0.7% (about 430 papers).

The *paper titles* are first collected directly from the official websites of each conference. These titles are matched using exact string matching combined with venue and year constraints to minimize ambiguity.

(4) Data Cleaning and Consistency Check. The data-cleaning process includes deduplication, removal of incomplete metadata, normalization of institution and author fields, and consolidation of citation statistics for papers appearing across multiple databases. These procedures are aligned with

⁸Up to October 2025.




Figure 2: The proposed bibliometric framework.

best practices in bibliometric research (Waltman and van Eck, 2012).

Finally, the dataset contains 60,219 long papers across the seven conferences, with more than 6M citation records, as shown in Tab. 1.

3.2 Multi-Dimensional Bibliometric Framework

Prior studies typically rely on a single metric, e.g., mean citations (Yang et al., 2018) or the H-index (Zhang, 2011), etc., to evaluate conference influence. However, they cannot capture the complex interaction between conference scale, scholarly impact, and structural citation patterns. To address this limitation, we develop a four-dimensional bibliometric framework that enables a more holistic characterization of conference evolution, as shown in Fig. 2.

(1) Scale Dimension. This dimension quantifies the growth of each conference as a scholarly venue. It includes three indicators: (i) *publication count (PC)*, the total number of accepted long papers, reflecting the venue’s output capacity; and (ii) *annual paper growth rate (APGR)*, the year-over-year percentage increase in accepted papers, which captures how rapidly a conference expands in size. (iii) *annual citation growth rate (ACGR)*, the year-over-year percentage increase in total citations accumulated by papers from each conference. ACGR quantifies the expansion of a venue’s accumulated knowledge stock (Gilbert, 1978).

(2) Influence Dimension. To capture the magnitude and distribution of scholarly influence, we use six indicators: (i) *average citations (AC)* and (ii) *median citations (MC)*, representing central tendencies of citation performance; (iii) *highly cited ratio (HCR)* (share of papers with more than 100 citations), measuring the upper tail of impact; and

(iv) *zero-cited ratio (ZCR)*, quantifying the share of papers that never attracted citations; (v) *H-index*, which reflect the concentration of highly influential papers; (vi) *milestone influence index (MII)*, defined as the proportion of papers exceeding both an absolute citation threshold (≥ 1000 citations)⁹ (Wang et al., 2021) and a relative threshold (top 0.1% of the annual citation distribution) (Wang et al., 2023). These indicators jointly describe whether a venue’s influence is broad-based or dominated by a small subset of papers.

(3) Citation Structure Dimension. Beyond the volume of citations, understanding where citations originate is essential for situating a venue within the scholarly communication network. This dimension includes: (i) *top-conference citation share (TCS)*, the proportion of citations coming from leading peer venues, indicating recognition among direct competitors; (ii) *top-journal citation share (TJS)*, capturing uptake by high-impact journals and interdisciplinary fields; and (iii) *top-conference citation coverage (TCC)*, defined as the proportion of the venue’s papers that receive at least one citation from a top conference, capturing how broadly its publications penetrate the upper layer of the conference citation network. We define *top conferences* as the union of CCF A-level venues (widely used across Asia-Pacific) and CORE A* venues (widely adopted in Australia, Europe, and North America), providing a standardized and widely adopted benchmark. For *top journals*, we use *Nature* and *Science* as representative elite journals, following prior scientometric research (Ioannidis, 2006). These indicators reveal how a venue’s knowledge diffuses across communities and whether its influence extends beyond its immediate academic domain.

(4) Quality–Quantity Elasticity (QOE). Traditional bibliometric indicators provide static snapshots of scale or impact, but they do not reveal whether a conference’s growth in publication volume is accompanied by proportional gains in scholarly influence. The core question in the current debate on conference quality is precisely whether rapid expansion is supported by equally rapid diffusion of knowledge. To measure this dynamic coupling, we introduce *Quality–Quantity Elasticity*.

⁹There is no universally accepted definition of a scientific milestone, but most studies that attempt to identify milestone contributions fall within the scientometrics literature, where citation-based indicators are commonly used as primary proxies.

ticity (QQE), grounded in scientific growth theory (Aghion et al., 1998).

Scientific growth theory conceptualizes research output as a knowledge stock, while citations represent spillover, diffusion, and recombination within the scientific ecosystem. Under this framework, an efficient conference should exhibit proportional—or even superlinear—growth in citation-based influence relative to its expansion in accepted papers, since a larger knowledge stock is expected to generate greater spillover effects.

Motivated by this perspective, we define QQE as

$$\text{QQE} = \frac{\text{citation growth rate}}{\text{acceptance growth rate}}. \quad (1)$$

Interpreting QQE. Because acceptance growth (B) may be positive or negative, we interpret QQE based on the *semantic direction* of change rather than the raw sign of A/B . Specifically:

- $A > 0, B > 0$ (**both increasing**): $\text{QQE} \geq 1$ indicates that citation influence scales at least proportionally with conference growth; $\text{QQE} < 1$ suggests potential dilution.
- $A < 0, B > 0$ (**citations down, scale up**): Always interpreted as dilution ($\text{QQE} < 0$).
- $A > 0, B < 0$ (**citations up, scale down**): Reflects *quality concentration*. QQE is treated as a **positive** value using $|A/B|$.
- $A < 0, B < 0$ (**both decreasing**): QQE is positive if acceptance shrinks faster ($|B| > |A|$), and negative if citation influence shrinks faster ($|A| > |B|$).

This multi-dimensional framework offers three benefits: (1) it captures scale, impact level, and citation-network position in a unified scheme; (2) it supports longitudinal tracking of how these properties evolve; and (3) it enables assessing whether growth reflects substantive influence rather than numerical expansion.

3.3 Analytical Method

We adopt a combined cross-conference and longitudinal analytical design.

(1) Cross-Conference Comparison. We compute the ten-year averages of fourteen bibliometric indicators for ACL, EMNLP, NAACL, AAAI, IJCAI, ICLR, and NeurIPS. This provides a macro-level snapshot of each venue’s overall scale, citation performance, impact distribution, citation com-

position, and growth efficiency (QQE). The analysis characterizes the long-term static landscape of major NLP/AI conferences and their relative positions.

(2) Longitudinal Evolution Analysis. We then track year-to-year changes using a one-year computation window, focusing on five core dynamic indicators: average and median citations (AC, MC), the proportions of highly cited and zero-cited papers (HCR, ZCR), QQE, milestone influence (MII), and within-NLP comparisons among ACL, EMNLP, and NAACL. This longitudinal component examines the temporal evolution of citation levels, impact distribution, and growth efficiency across the seven venues over the past decade, revealing the shifts in their developmental trajectories.

3.4 Normalization Controls

Because the selected conferences differ substantially in scale (with AI/ML venues typically accepting far more papers than NLP ones), raw impact indicators can systematically favor larger venues. To make fair comparisons, we apply two normalization controls to adjust for differences in publication volume.

(1) Normalized H-index. The conventional H-index increases with the number of publications, which means that larger conferences tend to obtain higher H-indices simply due to their scale. To mitigate this bias, we compute a *normalized H-index*:

$$\text{Norm-H} = \frac{\text{H-index}}{\text{total publications}} \quad (2)$$

This ratio reflects the density of highly influential papers per accepted paper. A declining Norm-H in the presence of growing conference size indicates that the share of high-impact work does not keep pace with expansion, suggesting potential dilution of impact.

(2) Gini Coefficient of Citation Distribution. Citations in NLP/AI conferences typically follow a long-tail pattern: a small number of papers receive very high citation counts, while the vast majority obtain few or none. As conference size increases, this tail often becomes longer, inflating total citation counts without necessarily reflecting an improvement in overall paper quality.

Hence, we compute the annual *Gini* coefficient of the citation distribution for each venue. For a given year, let the citation counts of all papers be sorted in ascending order: $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_n$,

where n is the number of papers and μ is the mean citation count. The Gini coefficient is computed as:

$$\text{Gini} = \frac{1}{n\mu} \sum_{i=1}^n (2i - n - 1) c_i \quad (3)$$

A value of 0 indicates a perfectly uniform distribution in which all papers receive the same number of citations, whereas values approaching 1 indicate extreme concentration in a small number of “blockbuster” papers.

4 Experiment

4.1 Main Results

We first summarize the major empirical patterns observed across all seven conferences and all four evaluation dimensions, as shown in Tab. 2.

Scale Dimension. NeurIPS and AAAI dominate in volume: NeurIPS has by far the largest publication count (PC = 18,627), followed by AAAI (12,795) and ICLR (7,645). Among NLP conferences, EMNLP is the largest (7,110), ACL sits in the mid-range (4,894), and NAACL is the smallest (2,541). Annual paper growth (APGR) reveals sharply different expansion regimes. ICLR shows the most aggressive scale growth (APGR = 54.43), well above NeurIPS (26.54), ACL (22.45), AAAI (21.54), and EMNLP (20.69), whereas NAACL (5.59) and IJCAI (5.16) have barely expanded over the past decade. Citation growth (ACGR) is also led by ICLR (61.72), with ACL (59.68) and NAACL (58.16) forming a second tier. NeurIPS (50.82), AAAI (52.37), and IJCAI (50.57) occupy the middle range, while EMNLP shows the slowest citation growth (43.46).

Impact Dimension. ICLR is clearly dominant in per-paper citation impact, achieving the highest average citations (AC = 217.74) and median citations (MC = 28). NeurIPS (AC = 120.85) and NAACL (AC = 119.17) form the next tier, with NAACL’s performance being particularly notable given its small size. ACL’s citation levels (AC = 90.93, MC = 26) are moderate: it clearly outperforms EMNLP (AC = 88.24, MC = 17) and AAAI (56.78, 15), while remaining substantially below ICLR and NeurIPS. IJCAI exhibits the weakest citation performance overall (AC = 37.99, MC = 12).

For the head of the distribution, ICLR again leads with the highest highly-cited ratio (HCR = 24.21%), followed by ACL (18.92%), NeurIPS (15.24%), and NAACL (14.05%). EMNLP

(12.91%), AAAI (9.96%), and especially IJCAI (6.81%) contribute comparatively fewer highly cited papers. On the other side, NeurIPS has the lowest zero-cited ratio (ZCR = 5.76%), closely followed by AAAI (6.02%) and ACL (6.07%). ICLR (6.61%) and NAACL (8.34%) lie in the middle. In contrast, EMNLP and IJCAI has the highest share of zero-cited work (9.31% and 10.46%), indicating a long tail of low-impact papers.

In terms of absolute H-index, NeurIPS is the most influential (H = 550), followed by ICLR (480), AAAI (311), ACL (285), EMNLP (277), IJCAI (191), and NAACL (179). When normalized by venue size, however, the ranking changes. NAACL achieves the highest normalized H-index (Norm-H = 7.04), with ICLR (6.28) and ACL (5.82) also showing dense concentrations of influential work. EMNLP (3.90), IJCAI (2.89), NeurIPS (2.95), and especially AAAI (2.43) have much lower Norm-H values, suggesting that their high absolute H-indices are substantially driven by volume rather than per-paper impact density. The Milestone Influence Index (MII) presents a similar picture: ICLR is the clear leader (MII = 2.85), followed by NeurIPS (1.56) and ACL (1.04). EMNLP (0.98) and NAACL (0.91) contribute a modest number of landmark papers, while AAAI (0.55) and particularly IJCAI (0.29) contribute comparatively few breakthrough works.

Citation Structure Dimension. ACL stands out in terms of structural integration within the top-conference network. It attains the highest top-conference citation share (TCS = 27.53) and the highest top-conference citation coverage (TCC = 86.88), indicating that a large fraction of ACL papers are cited by other leading venues and that these citations form a substantial share of its overall impact. EMNLP (TCS = 22.86, TCC = 79.48) and NAACL (18.29, 83.27) also show strong integration into the top-conference citation graph, where AAAI (16.22, 75.62) and IJCAI (16.40, 69.37) have more limited penetration. ICLR and NeurIPS have the lowest TCS values (12.54 and 12.49), and only moderate TCC (78.57 and 70.50), suggesting that a smaller fraction of their citations come from, and are distributed across, peer top conferences.

Top-journal citation share (TJS) presents a complementary pattern: AI conferences tend to dominate in uptake by general high-impact journals. AAAI achieves the highest TJS (5.59), closely followed by IJCAI (5.58) and NeurIPS (5.51), with ICLR also strong (5.10). In contrast, ACL (4.26),

Table 2: Comparison of major NLP/AI conferences across four dimensions. **Bold** indicates the highest value, and underlined indicate the lowest value. Abbreviations: PC = Publication Count; APGR = Annual Paper Growth Rate; ACGR = Annual Citation Growth Rate; AC = Average Citations; MC = Median Citations; HCR = Highly-Cited Ratio; ZCR = Zero-Cited Ratio; H = H-index; Norm-H = Normalized H-index; MII = Milestone Influence Index; TCS = Top-Conference Citation Share; TJS = Top-Journal Citation Share; TCC = Top-Conference Citation Coverage; QQE = Quality–Quantity Elasticity.

Conference	Scale			Influence							Citation			QQE
	PC	APGR	ACGR	AC	MC	HCR	ZCR	H	Norm-H	MII	TCS	TJS	TCC	QQE
ACL	4894	22.45	59.68	90.93	26	18.92	6.07	285	5.82↑	1.04	27.53	4.26	86.88	2.14
EMNLP	7110	20.69	<u>43.46</u>	88.24	17	12.91	9.31	277	3.90↑	0.98	22.86	4.43	79.48	4.08
NAACL	<u>2541</u>	5.59	58.16	119.17	21	14.05	8.34	<u>179</u>	7.04 ↑	0.91	18.29	<u>2.97</u>	83.27	4.00
AAAI	12795	21.54	52.37	56.78	15	9.96	6.02	311	<u>2.43</u> ↓	0.55	16.22	5.59	75.62	2.80
IJCAI	6607	<u>5.16</u>	50.57	<u>37.99</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>6.81</u>	10.46	191	2.89—	<u>0.29</u>	16.40	5.58	69.37	11.06
ICLR	7645	54.43	61.72	217.74	28	24.21	6.61	480	6.28—	2.85	12.54	5.10	78.57	<u>0.94</u>
NeurIPS	18627	26.54	50.82	120.85	19	15.24	<u>5.76</u>	550	2.95↓	1.56	<u>12.49</u>	5.51	70.50	1.89

EMNLP (4.43), and especially NAACL (2.97) receive a smaller proportion of their citations from top journals. Overall, NLP venues are more deeply embedded in the elite conference network, while AI conferences enjoy broader visibility in high-impact journals.

QQE Dimension. QQE reveals substantial heterogeneity across venues. IJCAI exhibits the highest elasticity (11.06) by a large margin. This stems from its highly constrained acceptance strategy: despite rising submission pressure, IJCAI shows the lowest APGR (5.16%) and even slight contraction in acceptance volume. EMNLP (4.08) and NAACL (4.00) form a medium-high elasticity group, reflecting restrained expansion coupled with steady gains in citation impact. ACL (2.14), AAAI (2.80), and NeurIPS (1.89) cluster into a medium elasticity tier: all three expanded rapidly in size while maintaining positive citation elasticity. In contrast, ICLR shows the lowest QQE (0.94), consistent with a saturation effect: despite extremely high static citation metrics, its marginal citation gains no longer outpace its rapid scale growth. Together, these patterns suggest that expansion strategies strongly shape long-term impact efficiency across major NLP/AI conferences.

Overall, the seven major NLP/AI conferences display distinct developmental patterns. ICLR leads in citation impact while approaching a performance plateau. NeurIPS dominates in scale but shows moderate efficiency relative to its size. ACL and NAACL remain structurally central within the top-conference citation network. IJCAI, though weaker in absolute impact, achieves the highest quality–quantity elasticity through stringent acceptance control. These results indicate that confer-




Figure 3: Temporal trends of average and median citations across major Conferences (2014–2024).

ence scale, influence, and growth efficiency do not evolve uniformly across venues.

4.2 Comprehensive Empirical Decomposition of Conference Trends (RQ1–RQ7)

In this section, we answer seven research questions (RQ1–RQ7) that together illuminate how conference scale, citation patterns, and cross-venue influence have evolved over the past decade.

RQ1. How Have Average and Median Citations Evolved Over Time?

Using a one-year citation window to capture the immediate visibility of newly published work (Fig. 3), we observe a clear stratification across venues. ICLR consistently dominates with exceptionally high one-year impact, peaking between 2015–2017 before entering a gradual decline from 2018 onward as the field matured and its early deep learning breakthroughs (e.g., optimization and architecture advances) diffused through the community. ACL exhibits strong performance and pronounced spikes between 2017–2020, coinciding with the introduction of the Transformer architecture (2017) and the first wave of large pre-trained language models such as BERT and GPT (2018–2020). A noticeable decline appears after




Figure 4: The head and tail of citation impact result.

2021, suggesting a weakening of early citation momentum in recent cycles. NeurIPS generally follows behind ACL, maintaining mid-range one-year impact until 2020 but showing a substantial drop in 2024. EMNLP and NAACL maintain solid per-paper visibility, each showing clear peaks (EMNLP in 2020 and 2023; NAACL in 2018 and 2021) that align with the consolidation and diversification of neural LMs and pretrained language model methods across tasks and domains. In contrast, AAAI and IJCAI display weaker and relatively steady one-year citation levels throughout the decade, reflecting slower early uptake compared with NLP- and ML-focused venues. In recent years, citation intensity has stabilized rather than grown, suggesting that the early-stage citation momentum of NLP research is reaching a natural saturation point, consistent with a field where foundational breakthroughs have matured and incremental work accumulates more gradually.

RQ2. How Have the Head and Tail of Citation Impact Shifted?

We use a one-year citation window, defining “annual highly-cited papers” as those receiving more than 50 citations within one year of publication, and “annual zero-cited papers” as those receiving no citations within the same period. We observe that ICLR consistently shows strong performance, with its proportion of highly-cited papers steadily increasing since 2015, while its zero-cited ratio remains low, reflecting the conference’s stable output of high-impact papers and effective quality control. NeurIPS and other NLP conferences, particularly ACL, also show a significant rise in the proportion of highly-cited papers after 2017, reaching 10.08% and 15.45% in 2020, respectively. This indicates the clear influence of the pre-trained model era (such as Transformer and BERT) on both NLP and AI fields. NAACL follows closely, with its proportion of highly-cited papers reaching 9.04% in 2018

and maintaining relative stability thereafter.

In contrast, EMNLP and IJCAI exhibit lower and more fluctuating proportions of highly-cited papers, with IJCAI consistently staying below 3% for high-impact papers. Additionally, its zero-cited paper ratio surged to 52.7%. EMNLP and AAAI show similar trends, with their annual zero-cited ratios ranging between 10% and 20%, indicating significant challenges in generating high-quality papers. Overall, ICLR stands out in both high-impact paper production and quality, while EMNLP and IJCAI face more severe issues of quality dilution.

RQ3. Is Citation Inequality Increasing Over Time?

To assess how evenly citations are distributed within each venue, we conducted a Gini coefficient analysis, as shown in Fig. 5. ACL and NAACL exhibit the most stable citation distributions, with Gini values consistently ranging between 0.63 and 0.77, suggesting that their internal impact distribution has remained relatively balanced despite growth in scale. In contrast, EMNLP, ICLR, NeurIPS, and AAAI show a clear “deconcentration → reconcentration” trajectory. EMNLP transitions from extreme concentration in 2014 (0.876) to its most even distribution in 2018 (0.661), then rises sharply again in 2023–2024, reaching 0.925. ICLR steadily decreases from 2014 to 2020 (0.867 → 0.657) before increasing again after 2021. NeurIPS similarly declines from 2014–2019 and then reverses upward from 2022 onward, reaching 0.869 in 2024. The most extreme case is IJCAI: although relatively stable from 2015–2023, its Gini coefficient spikes dramatically to 0.951 in 2024, the highest among all venues in the past decade.

Overall, rising citation inequality is not a field-wide phenomenon, where attention has increasingly converged on a small subset of papers. In contrast, ACL and NAACL maintain relatively stable and balanced citation structures. These findings suggest that citation reconcentration is closely tied to differences in conference expansion rates, topical focus, and tail-paper growth rather than a uniform decline in quality across venues.

RQ4. When Does Scale–Impact Decoupling Emerge?

The annual QQE trajectories reveal a clear separation between ML and NLP conferences, as shown in Fig. 6. ICLR and NeurIPS show relatively stable elasticity. ICLR remains mildly under-elastic in 2018–2020 (QQE \approx 0.6–0.9), dips slightly negative in 2022, and rebounds strongly in 2023–2024




Figure 5: Gini coefficient trends (2014–2024).




Figure 6: Annual QQE of major NLP/AI conferences (2014–2024).

(2.08 and 1.71). NeurIPS stays mostly above 1 throughout the decade and rises to 1.94–3.04 in 2022–2023, indicating that its citation influence generally grows faster than its publication volume.

In contrast, NLP venues display high volatility. ACL alternates between very high elasticity (2020, 2022, 2024) and sharp decoupling (−18.51 in 2021). EMNLP follows a similar pattern with large spikes and intermittent negative years. IJCAI exhibits some of the most extreme swings, including a deep drop in 2021 followed by a surge in 2024 (16.21), driven in part by its longstanding strict acceptance control, which amplifies sensitivity to small changes in citation or volume. NAACL also shows irregular swings when data is available.

Overall, ML venues maintain smoother and more predictable scale–impact coupling, while NLP venues demonstrate a “high-elasticity, high-volatility” dynamic, combining periods of rapid influence amplification with more frequent short-term decoupling.

RQ5. Is the Change Driven by Head Papers, Tail Papers, or the Full Distribution?

The per-year violin plots (Fig. 7) show that although all venues retain a long-tailed citation struc-

ture, their evolution diverges sharply. ML conferences (ICLR, NeurIPS) exhibit elevated centers and stable heads, indicating consistently strong early visibility for most papers and a tight alignment between accepted topics and community attention. NLP conferences, by contrast, show stable centers but widening tails, especially in EMNLP and NAACL after 2022, reflecting increasing heterogeneity and a growing share of minimally cited papers under rapid scale expansion. ICLR undergoes the largest structural shift—an exceptionally long head during the deep-learning breakthrough years (2014–2017) followed by post-2020 contraction, while IJCAI shows recent head compression, suggesting weaker alignment with citation behavior. Overall, these patterns indicate that changes in citation impact arise not from uniform shifts but from differentiated movements of the head, body, and tail, revealing structural divergence between ML and NLP venues.

RQ6. Which Venues Produce the Most Milestone-Level Papers in the LLM Era?

Fig. 8 shows substantial variation across conferences in their production of milestone-level research. Although NeurIPS has the highest number of ≥ 1000 -citation papers (291), it also has the largest overall volume, resulting in a proportion of only 1.56%. In contrast, ICLR, despite having far fewer total papers, achieves the highest proportion of milestone papers at 2.85%. Within the NLP community, ACL, EMNLP, and NAACL exhibit similar levels (around 0.9%–1.0%), indicating that high-impact work is relatively evenly distributed across these language-focused venues. AAAI and IJCAI show much lower proportions (0.55% and 0.29%, respectively), suggesting that they produce fewer ultra-high-impact papers in the LLM era.

RQ7. How Has the Internal Ecology of NLP Conferences Evolved?

Fig 9 shows that NAACL achieves the highest average citations (AC = 119.17), surpassing ACL (90.93) and EMNLP (88.24), suggesting strong per-paper influence despite its smaller scale. ACL attains the highest median citations (MC = 26), reflecting the most stable baseline impact among the three venues. In terms of high-impact output, ACL leads with the largest proportion of highly cited papers (HCR = 18.92%), exceeding NAACL (14.05%) and EMNLP (12.91%). For the long tail, EMNLP shows the highest zero-cited ratio (ZCR = 9.31%), followed by NAACL (8.34%), while ACL remains the lowest (6.07%), indicating a more




Figure 7: Evolution of citation distribution in major NLP/AI conferences.




Figure 8: Evolution of citation distribution in major NLP/AI conferences.




Figure 9: Internal impact ecology of ACL, EMNLP, and NAACL.

compact distribution of influence.

Regarding quality density, NAACL records the highest normalized H-index (Norm-H = 7.04), outperforming ACL (5.82) and EMNLP (3.90), suggesting that NAACL produces the most concentrated impact relative to its size. Finally, ACL attains the highest Milestone Influence Index (MII = 1.04), maintaining its role as the primary contributor of landmark work in NLP.

Overall, ACL combines strong baseline impact, a robust head, and a minimal tail; NAACL exhibits high-density influence within a compact scale; and EMNLP shows a more diffuse structure following its expansion. Accordingly, the internal ranking is: ACL > NAACL > EMNLP.

5 Discussion

A decade-long, cross-venue analysis indicates that top conferences have not undergone uniform quality decline; rather, scale expansion and paradigm shifts have produced structural divergence across ML, NLP, and AI venues. ML conferences (NeurIPS, ICLR) exhibit a raised central tendency and stable head, reflecting sustained field-wide attention and robust high-impact production. In contrast, AI conferences (AAAI, IJCAI) display a shrinking head and expanding tail, revealing structural weakening under competitive pressure.

Within the NLP domain, ACL, NAACL, and

EMNLP form a distinct internal hierarchy. ACL maintains the most stable median performance, the lowest zero-citation ratio, and the highest contribution to milestone work. NAACL demonstrates the strongest influence density relative to its compact scale. EMNLP shows clear evidence of quality erosion, including declining medians, rising zero-cited proportions, and markedly increased citation inequality since 2022.

The QQE analysis provides a unifying explanation for these patterns. ML venues maintain efficient scale–impact coupling, with influence growth largely aligned with expansion. NLP venues exhibit high elasticity combined with high volatility, alternating between amplification phases and sharp decoupling. AI venues display persistently low elasticity, consistent with their weakening citation structure. These findings reveal three differentiated evolutionary trajectories: strengthening centers in ML, widening stratification in NLP, and structural decline in AI.

6 Conclusion

This study presents the first decade-long, cross-venue empirical analysis of seven leading NLP/AI conferences (2014–2024). Using a four-dimensional bibliometric framework and the proposed QQE, we systematically evaluate how conference scale, citation impact, structural dispersion, and cross-venue influence have evolved under rapid expansion. Our findings reveal a clear pattern of structural divergence rather than a uniform decline in conference quality. ML venues (ICLR, NeurIPS) sustain the highest and most stable influence levels, characterized by elevated centers, concentrated heads, and efficient scale–impact coupling. NLP venues exhibit widening internal stratification: ACL maintains the most stable core and broadest citation reach, NAACL attains the highest impact density relative to scale, while EMNLP shows signs of quality erosion alongside rapid expansion. AI venues (AAAI, IJCAI) demonstrate persistent structural weakening, reflected in low citation density, high tail proportions, and volatile QQE. These findings highlight the need for nuanced governance strategies tailored to each venue’s developmental trajectory, moving beyond the oversimplified narrative of an across-the-board decline in top-conference quality.

7 Limitations

Our study has several limitations. First, although we aggregate data from multiple high-quality sources (ACL Anthology, Semantic Scholar, OpenAlex), citation records may still contain minor inconsistencies due to database update delays or incomplete indexing. These issues are unlikely to affect cross-venue patterns but may slightly influence fine-grained year-to-year values. Second, our analysis focuses on long papers; short papers, findings papers, and workshop papers are excluded due to inconsistent archival standards across venues. While this choice ensures comparability, it may omit certain types of emerging research. Third, citation-based metrics inherently lag behind real-time research impact and may partially reflect field-level citation norms rather than pure scientific quality. Finally, our framework captures structural trends but cannot fully account for venue-specific policy changes (e.g., review process adjustments, submission format changes), which may also shape conference trajectories.

These limitations point to opportunities for future work, such as integrating acceptance-rate dynamics, reviewer–author interaction data, or field-normalized indicators to obtain a more granular understanding of conference evolution.

References

- Philippe Aghion, Peter Howitt, Maxine Brant-Collett, and Cecilia García-Peñalosa. 1998. *Endogenous growth theory*. MIT press.
- Chengyao Chen, Zhitao Wang, Wenjie Li, and Xu Sun. 2018. Modeling scientific influence for research trending topic prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32.
- William L Croft and Jörg-Rüdiger Sack. 2022. Predicting the citation count and citescore of journals one year in advance. *Journal of Informetrics*, 16(4):101349.
- G Gilbert. 1978. Measuring the growth of science: A review of indicators of scientific growth. *Scientometrics*, 1(1):9–34.
- Alex Hayes and Karl Rohe. 2025. Co-factor analysis of citation networks. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 34(2):448–461.
- John PA Ioannidis. 2006. Concentration of the most-cited papers in the scientific literature: analysis of journal ecosystems. *PloS one*, 1(1):e5.

- Sehrish Iqbal, Saeed-UI Hassan, Naif Radi Aljohani, Salem Alelyani, Raheel Nawaz, and Lutz Bornmann. 2021. A decade of in-text citation analysis based on natural language processing and machine learning techniques: an overview of empirical studies. *Scientometrics*, 126(8):6551–6599.
- Lun-Wei Ku, André FT Martins, and Vivek Srikumar. 2024. Proceedings of the 62nd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: Long papers). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- Iliia Kuznetsov, Iryna Gurevych, Yusuke Miyao, Yang Gao, and Steffen Eger. 2019. Does my rebuttal matter? insights from a major. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Lokman I Meho. 2019. Using scopus’s citesscore for assessing the quality of computer science conferences. *Journal of Informetrics*, 13(1):419–433.
- Julian Michael, Ari Holtzman, Alicia Parrish, Aaron Mueller, Alex Wang, Angelica Chen, Divyam Madaan, Nikita Nangia, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Jason Phang, and 1 others. 2023. What do nlp researchers believe? results of the nlp community meta-survey. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 16334–16368.
- Saif Mohammad. 2020. Examining citations of natural language processing literature. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5199–5209.
- Humza Naveed, Asad Ullah Khan, Shi Qiu, Muhammad Saqib, Saeed Anwar, Muhammad Usman, Naveed Akhtar, Nick Barnes, and Ajmal Mian. 2025. A comprehensive overview of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 16(5):1–72.
- Anna Rogers and Isabelle Augenstein. 2020. [What can we do to improve peer review in NLP?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1256–1262, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Giuseppe Russo, Manoel Horta Ribeiro, Tim Ruben Davidson, Veniamin Veselovsky, and Robert West. 2025. The ai review lottery: Widespread ai-assisted peer reviews boost paper scores and acceptance rates. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 9(7):1–28.
- George Vrettas and Mark Sanderson. 2015. Conferences versus journals in computer science. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(12):2674–2684.
- Jan Philip Wahle, Terry Ruas, Mohamed Abdalla, Bela Gipp, and Saif Mohammad. 2023. We are who we cite: Bridges of influence between natural language processing and other academic fields. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12896–12913.
- Ludo Waltman and Nees Jan van Eck. 2012. A new methodology for constructing a publication-level classification system of science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(12):2378–2392.
- Shiyun Wang, Yaxue Ma, Jin Mao, Yun Bai, Zhentao Liang, and Gang Li. 2023. Quantifying scientific breakthroughs by a novel disruption indicator based on knowledge entities. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(2):150–167.
- Xue Wang, Xuemei Yang, Jian Du, Xuwen Wang, Jiao Li, and Xiaoli Tang. 2021. A deep learning approach for identifying biomedical breakthrough discoveries using context analysis. *Scientometrics*, 126(7):5531–5549.
- Qiyao Wei, Samuel Holt, Jing Yang, Markus Wulfmeier, and Mihaela van der Schaar. 2025. The ai imperative: Scaling high-quality peer review in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08134*.
- Zongbao Yang, Shaohong Zhang, Wenjun Shen, Xiaofei Xing, and Ying Gao. 2018. [Artificial intelligence related publication analysis based on citation counting](#). *IEEE Access*, 6:52205–52217.
- Lin Zhang. 2011. Re-ranking of high-impact ai journals based on h-index. In *Engineering Education and Management: Vol 2, Results of the 2011 International Conference on Engineering Education and Management (ICEEM2011)*, pages 191–197. Springer.

A Appendix

Table 3: Conference growth rates and QQE

Conference	Year	Paper Growth Rate	Citation Growth Rate	QQE
ACL	2014	–	–	–
ACL	2015	0.18	0.32	1.81
ACL	2016	0.32	0.96	3.00
ACL	2017	-0.17	0.03	0.20
ACL	2018	0.31	0.22	0.72
ACL	2019	0.81	0.63	0.77
ACL	2020	0.28	1.40	5.03
ACL	2021	-0.02	-0.42	-18.51
ACL	2022	0.06	0.55	9.50
ACL	2023	0.53	0.66	1.23
ACL	2024	-0.05	0.47	8.82
EMNLP	2014	–	–	–
EMNLP	2015	0.38	1.14	3.02
EMNLP	2016	-0.15	0.92	6.02
EMNLP	2017	0.22	-0.02	-0.10
EMNLP	2018	0.69	0.11	0.15
EMNLP	2019	0.24	0.28	1.14
EMNLP	2020	0.10	3.32	32.32
EMNLP	2021	0.13	-0.55	-4.30
EMNLP	2022	-0.02	0.16	7.26
EMNLP	2023	0.26	1.93	7.31
EMNLP	2024	0.21	1.12	5.29
NAACL	2015	–	–	–
NAACL	2016	-0.03	0.78	29.13
NAACL	2018	–	–	–
NAACL	2019	0.28	0.16	0.58
NAACL	2021	–	–	–
NAACL	2022	-0.08	-0.26	-3.11
NAACL	2024	–	–	8.86
AAAI	2014	–	–	–
AAAI	2015	0.34	2.01	5.86
AAAI	2016	0.01	0.45	60.31
AAAI	2017	0.18	0.26	1.50
AAAI	2018	0.48	1.45	3.02
AAAI	2019	0.20	0.23	1.16
AAAI	2020	0.39	0.36	0.91
AAAI	2021	0.06	-0.04	-0.78
AAAI	2022	-0.20	-0.18	-0.91
AAAI	2023	0.30	0.35	1.18
AAAI	2024	0.40	1.15	2.85
IJCAI	2015	–	–	–
IJCAI	2016	-0.04	0.38	9.10
IJCAI	2017	0.21	0.98	4.77
IJCAI	2018	0.07	-0.01	-0.20
IJCAI	2019	0.19	0.12	0.62
IJCAI	2020	-0.31	-0.13	-0.41
IJCAI	2021	0.01	-0.14	-16.55
IJCAI	2022	0.16	0.15	0.98
IJCAI	2023	-0.06	-0.01	-0.12
IJCAI	2024	0.24	3.86	16.21
ICLR	2014	–	–	–
ICLR	2015	–	–	–
ICLR	2016	–	–	–
ICLR	2017	–	–	–
ICLR	2018	0.70	0.51	0.73
ICLR	2019	0.49	0.29	0.59
ICLR	2020	0.37	0.33	0.88
ICLR	2021	0.26	-0.08	-2.03
ICLR	2022	0.28	-0.08	2.08
ICLR	2023	0.44	0.91	2.08
ICLR	2024	0.43	0.74	1.71
NeurIPS	2014	–	–	–
NeurIPS	2015	-0.02	0.99	58.00
NeurIPS	2016	0.42	0.94	2.26
NeurIPS	2017	0.19	0.21	1.09
NeurIPS	2018	0.49	0.53	1.09

Conference	Year	ACGR	APGR	QQE
NeurIPS	2019	0.42	0.77	1.85
NeurIPS	2020	0.33	0.38	1.15
NeurIPS	2021	0.23	-0.10	-0.45
NeurIPS	2022	0.14	0.28	1.94
NeurIPS	2023	0.20	0.62	3.04
NeurIPS	2024	0.25	0.40	1.58