

MICCAI 2022 Area Chairs Reviewer monitoring and Meta-review

Dear Area Chairs:

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 (26%) indicated the reviewer was not willing to review the suggested paper, and also a large number of reviewers (300) were overloaded with 25 or more suggested papers each.

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

Your tasks for the next few weeks are:

1. Check the reviewers assigned to your papers immediately. If 2 reviewers from the same institute are assigned to the same paper, inform us immediately. Please note we have allowed reviewers to submit paper reassignment requests until March 27th. We will be reshuffling papers on March 28th. Please check your reviewer assignments again on the 29th.
2. 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 7th**. Emails to remind reviewers to submit will be sent out centrally by the CMT platform manager, one week, 3 days, and the day before the due day.
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.
4. After the review deadline, you will need to complete your meta-review by **April 27th**. 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.

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)

- We have displayed the reviewer responses to questions 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 17 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

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

The screenshot shows the Meta-Reviewer Console interface. At the top, a navigation bar includes 'Help Center', 'Select Your Role', and a dropdown menu currently set to 'Meta-Reviewer' (callout 1). Below this, the 'Meta-Reviewer Console' title is followed by a note about viewing welcome messages and instructions (callout 2). The main content area is titled 'Meta-Reviewing' and shows a table of papers. The table has columns for Paper ID, Title, Subject Areas (Primary and Secondary), Reviewers (with sub-columns for Q9, Q11, Q12, Q13, Q16, Q17), Assigned, Completed, % Completed, Meta-Reviewers, Meta-Review, and a 'More' button (callout 7). A specific paper is highlighted: 'A Sense of Direction in Biomedical Neural Networks' (callout 4). Its title is circled (callout 5). The 'Reviewers' column for this paper shows 'Reviewer 1' and 'Reviewer 2' with their respective scores (callout 3). The 'View Reviews' button is circled (callout 8). The 'Actions' dropdown menu is open, showing options like 'Download', 'View All Reviews', 'Import Meta-Reviews', and 'Email Reviewers' (callout 6). The 'More' button is also circled (callout 7).

Paper ID	Title	Subject Areas		Review						Assigned	Completed	% Completed	Meta-Reviewers	Meta-Review	More		
		Primary	Secondary	Reviewer	Q9	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q16							Q17	
199	A Sense of Direction in Biomedical Neural Networks	Image Segmentation	Machine Learning - Interpretability / Explainability; Organ - Eye; Organ - Vessel	Reviewer 1	7	3	6	3	0	0	2	1	50%	Meta-Reviewer Q4	ID: Meta-Reviewer #2 Enter Meta-Review	0	0%

Screen 2

Paper ID↑	Title	Subject Areas		Review			Meta-Reviewers	Meta-Review	Review Rating		Actions	
		Primary	Secondary	Reviewers	Assigned	Completed			% Completed	Completed		% Completed
e.g. <input type="text"/> <small>Clear</small>	filter... <small>Clear</small>	filter... <small>Clear</small>	filter... <small>Clear</small>	filter... <small>Clear</small>	e.g. <3 <small>Clear</small>	e.g. <3 <small>Clear</small>	e.g. <3 <small>Clear</small>	filter... <small>Clear</small>	click here... <small>Clear</small>	e.g. <3 <small>Clear</small>	e.g. <3 <small>Clear</small>	
199	A Sense of Direction in Biomedical Neural Networks Download Show Abstract	Image Segmentation	Machine Learning - Interpretability / Explainability; Organ - Eye; Organ - Vessel	Reviewer Q9 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q16 Q17 Reviewer 1 7 3 6 3 0 0 Reviewer 2	2	1 View Reviews	50%	Meta-Reviewer Q4 MetaReviewer #2 <input type="text" value="-1"/>	ID: Meta-Reviewer #2 Enter Meta-Review	0	0%	More

9. Reviewer's responses to a few important questions are displayed here for your convenience:

- Q9: Overall Opinion ranging from 1 (lowest) to 8 (highest)
- Q11: rank of the paper in the reviewer's stack
- Q12: total number of papers in reviewer's stack
- Q13: reviewer's expertise values ranging from 1 (lowest) to 4 (highest)
- Q16: oral presentation recommendation – 1 (Yes) and 0 (No)
- Q17: young scientist award recommendation – 1 (Yes) and 0 (No)

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 to submit 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 **“view reviews”** (#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 paper is accepted for publication and that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2021 Reviewers' Guide <https://miccai2021.org/en/REVIEWER-GUIDE>.
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

Screen 4

You have the option to view all reviews in a side-by-side mode or a printer-friendly view by clicking the “Action” button and selecting “View All Reviewers” (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