Maybe my bad, I should've been more detailed. But I really didn't want to make the post any longer. Specifically, like I said, in the context of the list, convenience is defined by how much attention you have to pay to the game in order to get a par level of performance (to similarly rated/performing classes) out of the class. This includes, but is not limited to, having to pay attention to health to time a heal, having to watch mana to rest, having to rest in general requiring more interaction- basically anything that requires a level of preeemptive thinking before taking an action, or an action that takes either far longer or deviates from the normal interaction scheme you'd have with the majority of farmers. One can make an argument here that some people prefer having things to pay attention to, but-
1) the list is made to be reflective of how most people interact with the game. This is still partially subjective and based on our understanding of the players, but that's not something we can easily resolve.
2) I asssume that logically, the less human error is potentially introduced via this, the more efficient (or at least the more qualitatively/potentially efficient, if it's just overbuffer. e.g., how easy it is to pick up slack) farming would be. Like I said earlier, difference in spots on the efficiency curve. If there is no difference between maximum and minimum efficiency, would that not reasonably be a better farming class with less potential loss of efficiency, while maintaining the same maximum performance rate?
To borrow the same example you'd given, I'd rather not spend 20 extra minutes farming a boss, you're right. But I also farm while watching movies and such, so maybe I'd be fine sacrificing a minute or two so I can better enjoy my time spent, since with classes like SSG I don't have to look at the screen at all, unlike classes like Daimon. Sometimes I'm fine losing 10% total time on a class that's a bit slower, but far less difficult to lose efficiency with, so I don't risk taking an extra 20% of the time. Acceptable margins of loss play a role here, whether it's voiced like that or not. But also, depending on the task, sometimes I want to pay full attention and use Daimon or something. I have to take a decent guess at how evenly that distributes for most people. Maybe it's the opposite for some people. It's highly subjective and I can only adjust for this with my perceived notion of the playerbase, along with a bit of reasoning.
This is why I account for the two factors somewhat separately, and then try and weight them together. If you propose a different general subjectivity of the playerbase, like "the majority of players prefer to pay attention to the game because they find it more fun," then it would change the ratings a decent bit.

Regarding Shaman, it falls under this argument. When there are other classes that can achieve par rates without a chance of slowdown or without needing to rest, would they not just be better, rated in this system, based on that observation?
However, I did take to re-evaluating a bunch of the farming classes yesterday. I did move EI and SSG back down, for consideration of what you'd mentioned, and they didn't perform as well as I was expecting under retesting (they still performed par or better than AA and BB under more spawn spaces though, lol).
Regarding the "niche" situation, I do agree, but that's why niches are also weighted to reflect how often/much time they are in any given player's activity. For example, if 75% of the monsters in the game that players often fought were undead, Paladin would score considerably better. That being said, you were right, icestormarena isn't high enough weight for it to be a sole consideration. The classes also didn't perform, which was sad.c
Unfortunately, Master of Moglins does really perform better than any farming class in like, 90% of situations. Which is sad. I haven't found a compelling argument to even reconsider that one yet, more tests only seem to reinforce it instead. (except with scarve aoe aa abuse, but even then it's par. MoM whyyyyyy)

And, you do make a good point, really. And Shim's said similar. LC really is teetering on the edge between the two rating. It's difficult because it really does perform better in many situations and par in some, and a bit worse in some. If you weight screen hopping farming higher under the assumption that most players do screen hop, it does reasonably drop back to A. I agree with your assessment of resolving spawn time advantage, but even that given, it still performs par in some situations and at most acceptably below par in

some. As well, I don't think that an overwhelming number of people farm by screen/room hopping, not enough to drop it down to A. But again, I keep that S is less of a rating jump over A in this case, more of a meta statement. Why that's included in the list- well, originally this wasn't meant to be public. Maybe I'll rework how the top end of the list works for it to make more sense in that situation. It seems contradictory to me too that a list's top rating is partially meta-statement, when the list is meant to be reflective of the general populus.
Also, Shim is not a staff member. Actually, he applied in the open call atm.

Regarding the Styx test- I think I miscommunicated that a bit and perhaps you misunderstood- that test doesn't directly contribute to the rating in any way. It's a way to break down and analyze expected advantage given to classes based on health. It's not a tool for rating performance so much as understanding functions, breaking down primary/secondary target damage disparity, etc. The results from it caaaan influence the rating, but only when translated to help us adjust for margin of error in the tests actually reflective of gameplay.
Regarding testing in a room with multiple people- you can test for spawn advantage via high-mob count rooms, it's generally redundant enough to get an acceptable margin of error. Even assuming it weren't, then the shortest cooldowns with the least resource issues would get the highest advantage, which is pretty easy to adjust for.

Overall, I stress that different lists use different rating systems, and this is more explaining how these classes and their tested results fit into the context of this rating system, with some error based on deviation from the tests themselves. **But, I think it's really good to open these kinds of discussions**, because it's what gets me to rethink *how* I'm doing the rating in the first place, and reevaluate my testing methodology to be more reflective of my endgoal. Feedback has already gotten several changes to happen. There are even more factors to talk about, you're right. So many that I've just relegated many of them to acceptable margin of error, and accounted for that with the rough total distribution between tierings, and how many tiers. **So thanks for the feedback!**