# MICCAI 2021 Area Chairs Reviewer monitoring and Meta-review

Dear {Recipient.FirstName}:

Reviewers have now received their assignments. Thanks for your help in this process!

We have matched reviewers to papers with a large weight on your suggestions and on the reviewer bids and avoided assigning reviewers who indicated they were not willing to review a specific paper.  You may notice that in some cases, your papers will have been assigned to reviewers that you did not select or to reviewers who did not rank highly in your selection. This is unavoidable as a relatively large portion of bids (33%) indicated the reviewer was not willing to review the assigned paper, and also a large number of reviewers (263) were overloaded with 25 or more assignments each.

Please make sure to read the [AC Guidelines](AC Guidelines) and [the MICCAI Review Process](the MICCAI Review Process) if you have not yet done so.

Your tasks for the next few weeks are:

1. monitor the quality of the reviews of the papers that have been assigned to you.   If you see reviews that are uninformative and/or inappropriate, then please use the mail icon beside the reviewer's name to email the individual reviewer and request changes. If the review is positive then it needs to provide information about what the contributions are, if they are negative then they should provide guidance to the authors on how to improve their papers; all comments should be supported by evidence. Reviews from reviewers are due **April 20th**.  Emails to remind reviewers to submit will be sent out centrally by the CMT platform manager, one week, 3 days, and the day before due day.

2. After the review deadline, you will need to complete your meta-review by **May 7th**. Information on overall review score distribution and approximate # papers to be accepted/rejected/sent for rebuttal will be sent out shortly after the review deadline has passed.

3. You must give each review a rating (Exceeded Expectations; Met expectations; Failed to meet expectations – see screen 3 below.  This helps us identify bad reviewers and to improve the selection of reviewers for future meetings.

## Useful CMT Tips and screenshots:

1. For papers where you have not yet entered meta-review, you will only see the "Enter Meta-Review" option in the meta-review column.  You must click the "submit" button at the end of the form when you are done entering your meta-review.  For papers where you have already entered meta-reviews, you will see two options: "Edit Meta-Review" and "View Meta-Review" in the meta-review column.
2. For your convenience, your recommendation for each paper (provisional accept, rebuttal, provisional reject) will be displayed in the meta-reviewer column. (see item 11 in screenshot #2)
3. We have displayed the reviewer responses to questions 8, 10, 11, 12, 15 and 16 numerically in the reviewer column.  You may use these values to help you weigh the scores from the various reviewers, as you arrive at an overall assessment of the paper.

# Screen 1

1. Change your role to Meta-Reviewer.
2. Read the guideline documents
3. Look at the reviewers who have been assigned to the paper.
4. View the submission summary of the paper, including the statement of Novelty/Impact, and response to the reproducibility checklist
5. Individual paper download.
6. "Actions" button:
   a. Download: download all papers at once. You can choose to download just the papers or with the supplementary materials.
   b. View All reviewers: to view all reviews in a side-by-side mode or a printer-friendly view. See screen #4.
   c. Import Meta-reviewer: You have the option to perform your meta-review offline and upload your meta-reviews in a single XML file.
   d. Email Reviewers: To email all reviewers or to email reviewers who have not yet submitted their reviews
7. "More" button:
   a. Edit Meta-Reviewer note: To report format violation of a specific paper
   b. Email Reviewers: to email reviewers of a specific paper
8. When reviews are being uploaded you can click here to see them. You must rate each individual review (See screen #3).

## Screen 2



9. Reviewer's responses to Questions 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16 (Overall opinion, rank of the paper in the reviewer's stack, total number of papers in reviewer's stack, and reviewer expertise values, oral presentation recommendation, young scientist award recommendation) are displayed here.

10. Submit or edit or view your meta-review here. For papers where you have not yet entered meta-review, you will only see the "Enter Meta-Review" option in the meta-review column. You must click the "submit" button at the end of the form when you are done entering your meta-review. For papers where you have already entered meta-reviews, you will see two options: "Edit Meta-Review" and "View Meta-Review" in the meta-review column.

11. Your recommendation of the paper (accept (1) /reject (-1) /rebuttal (0)) is displayed here.

12. If you have finished rating your reviewers, your progress will be shown here. See screen #3 on how to rate reviewers.

## Screen 3

To rate reviews, click <mark>"view reviews"</mark> (#8, screen 1), and you will see an option to rate each review at the top right-hand corner of each review.

**View Reviews**

🖨 Print

**Paper ID**
1
**Paper Title**
my test paper

**Reviewer #1 (Marleen de Bruijne)**

Not Submitted

**Reviewer #2 (MICCAI 2021)**

Rate Review: Not rated | Exceeded Expectations ▾

Not rated

Failed to Meet Expectations

Met Expectations

Exceeded Expectations

**Questions**

1. Please confirm that you consent to your review being made publicly available (without disclosing your name) if the
and that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2021 Reviewers' Guide https://miccai2021.org/en/REVIEWER-GUID
Agreement accepted

2. Please describe the contribution of the paper (a few lines)
none

3. Please list the main strengths of the paper; you should write about a novel formulation, an original way to use data, demonstration of
clinical feasibility, a novel application, a particularly strong evaluation, or anything else that is a strong aspect of this work. Please
provide details, for instance, if a method is novel, explain what aspect is novel and why this is interesting.
none

4. Please list the main weaknesses of the paper. Please provide details, for instance, if you think a method is not novel, explain why and
provide a reference to prior work.

## Screen 4

You have the option to view all reviews in a side-by-side mode or a printer-friendly view by clicking the <mark>"Action"</mark> button and selecting <mark>"View All Reviewers"</mark> (6b, screen 1).

### View All Reviews

| Paper ID | 1 |
|----------|---|
| Paper Title | my test paper |

| | Reviewer #1 Marleen de Bruijne (Erasmus MC Rotterdam / University of Copenhagen) | Reviewer #2 MICCAI 2021 (MICCAI Society) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Please confirm that you consent to your review being made publicly available (without disclosing your name) if the paper is accepted and that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2021 Reviewers' Guide https://miccai2021.org/en/REVIEWER-GUIDELINES.html | | Agreement accepted |
| 2. Please describe the contribution of the paper (a few lines) | | none |
| 3. Please list the main strengths of the paper; you should write about a novel formulation, an original way to use data, demonstration of clinical feasibility, a novel application, a particularly strong evaluation, or anything else that is a strong aspect of this work. Please provide details, for instance, if a method is novel, explain what aspect is novel and why this is interesting. | | none |
| 4. Please list the main weaknesses of the paper. Please provide details, for instance, if you think a method is not novel, explain why and provide a | | none |