MICCAI 2024
Area Chair Orientation

March 15, 2024:

Program Chairs:
- Marius George Linguraru, Children's National Hospital
- Qi Dou, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
- Aasa Feragen, Technical University of Denmark
- Matina Giannarou, Imperial College London
- Ben Glocker, Imperial College London

Submission Platform Manager: Kitty Wong, The MICCAI Society
Thanks for Your Service for MICCAI 2024!
Goals

• Orientation of process, timelines, and expectations
• Collection of feedback
• Q & A
MICCAI 2024 STATISTICS

• 4515 intent to submit, 2876 full paper submissions (nearly 22% increase vs 2365 on 2023)

• Papers were screened for anonymity, page length, template issues. ~130 will be desk rejected

• 153 ACs

• ~2100 reviewers
Process Overview

Phase I: Primary AC on all papers (~20 papers per AC)

Phase II: Secondary AC on additional rebuttal papers (~10 papers per AC)

Phase III: Ternary AC on select papers with ties
Key Responsibilities for Area Chairs

• **Primary AC for ~20-25 papers:**
  - Check paper formatting, suggest reviewers, shepherd review process, monitor review quality
  - **NEW THIS YEAR:** No metareview/AC selection of rebuttal papers
  - Early accept and early reject decisions will be based solely on the reviewer scores.
  - ACs must provide a lightweight quality and sanity check on the reviews and flag any concerns with reviewers’ decisions.
  - Identify Oral papers and Award candidates from the accepted batch and categorize them (for sessions)
  - Rate reviews

• **Secondary AC for an additional ~10 papers**
  - *Encourage reviewers to finalize their ratings after rebuttal*
  - Make initial recommendations and complete meta-reviews for rejects (optionally for accepts)
  - **NEW THIS YEAR:** Meta-reviews are optional for accepts
  - Identify Oral papers and Award candidates from the papers you are recommending accepts and categorize them (for sessions)
  - Rate reviews

• **Ternary AC for select papers**
  - Help handle ties
Primary AC Assignments

• Receive primary paper assignments on March 19
  • Based on TPMS, subject areas (keywords), & conflicts of interest

• Screen paper for the following issues & notify PCs
  • Anonymization
  • Overlength
  • Formatting
  • Overlapping submissions

*Authors are also allowed to put their MICCAI submission on ArXiv*
Reviewer Suggestions

- Suggest 10-15 reviewers for each paper in ranked order, considering:
  - TPMS
  - Reviewer profile (expertise, publications, etc) *important, do not rely just on TPMS*
  - Subject areas
    - Scores of subject area matching are less informative
  - Reviewer load
    - Avoid reviewers already with >20 suggestions
- Detailed instructions will be sent later
- Final reviewer assignment considers a combination of automatic TPMS, keyword matching, AC suggestions, and reviewer bidding
Assignment to reviewers (revised by Kitty)

• April 4 (paper assignment to reviewers, manual adjustments)

• April 5
  • ACs check for issues in reviewer assignment and reassignment (e.g., COIs, reviewers from the same institute)

• April 8
  • Paper release to reviewers.
  • NEW THIS YEAR: ACs handle all reassignment requests.
  • When assigning a paper to a new reviewer, must email new reviewer to ensure they are willing to take on an additional paper.
  • DO NOT add a reviewer to a paper without asking.
  • DO NOT abuse this by adding additional reviewers to your papers!!!
Review Period

• Review Period (Officially Apr 8 - 25)
  • Shepherd review process
  • Monitor review quality as they come in.
  • Communicate with the reviewers if review quality is low (email through CMT)

• Deadlines
  • Official review deadline (Thursday, April 25)
  • Unofficial internal deadline (Monday, April 29)
  • Reminders of deadline will be sent centrally by Kitty
  • Emergency review period: April 30 - May 6

• Early accept/reject and rebuttal decisions:
  • NEW THIS YEAR: Early accept and early reject decisions will be based solely on the reviewer scores. ACs are not required to provide a meta-review on early accepted or early rejected papers but ACs must provide a lightweight quality and sanity check on the reviews. AC must flag any concerns with reviewers’ decisions
  • AC should review early accepted papers in their batch and identify Oral papers and Award candidates
  • Categorize accepted paper (for sessions)
  • ACs must rate reviews
Monitor Review Quality

- **Reviews of accepted papers will be made public.**
- Communicate with reviewers for improving review quality when..
  - The review is short and uninformative
  - There is no justification of the score
  - The review has only positive comments but recommends reject
  - The review has only negative comments but recommends accept
  - The reviewer states that the work is not novel without providing evidence (e.g., citations to prior work)
  - The reviewer asks to cite their own paper(s) without good reason
  - The language is inappropriate
  - ....

- **NB!** Reviewers should not ask for additional experiments in rebuttal – step in if they do
- **NB!** Formatting/identifying authors/not sharing code or data are not reasons for rejection; instead flag or raise as a concern
Application vs. Methodological Studies

• See MICCAI 2024 submission guidelines

• **Methodological studies**
  • Demonstrate clear innovations and contributions over the state of the art methodologies.
  • Evaluation and performance assessment is potentially limited to proof of concepts or small-size validation studies.

• **Application studies including clinical translation**
  • Demonstrate clear clinical value of existing techniques, or adoption of state-of-the-art methods to a new problem or context, with appropriate and rigorous evaluation design
  • Do not necessarily need to involve fundamental methodological innovations
  • *Examine how authors and reviewers have considered, argued, and justified paper contributions according to its categories.*
CAI vs. MIC Papers

• **Significance/Innovation** of CAI works can include:
  • Novel clinical applications
  • Demonstration of clinical feasibility even on a single subject/animal/phantom
  • Novel MIC approach to solving a CAI need
  • Proposal of a cost-effective approach

• **Experimental evaluations** of CAI works are typically much more challenging (than MIC studies) in
  • Clinical evaluation on patients
  • Achieving a large sample size
  • Comparison with existing systems
Special sessions on Clinical Translation and Health Equity

- **Clinical translation papers**
  - Translation of methodology with impact on clinical workflow and evaluation
  - Novel insights into clinical challenges

- **Health Equity**
  - New methods and applications that are attuned to diverse healthcare settings, in terms of data, infrastructure, resources, and costs, especially to address challenges in limited-resource settings
Secondary AC Assignments

• Each rebuttal paper will be assigned a secondary AC in addition to the primary AC

• Each AC will receive ~10 additional secondary paper assignments

• **NEW THIS YEAR:** after rebuttals are in
  • Reviewers are only asked to revise their reviews (by May 27)
  • There is no reviewer discussion period

• Primary and secondary AC can still discuss via CMT email
Polling Time

Would you find it beneficial to be able to see your fellow AC’s identities during post-rebuttal discussion? (only for ACs; remain anonymous to reviewers)
AC Final Meta-Reviews

- Recommendations & meta-reviews for rebuttal papers (primary & secondary)
  - NEW THIS YEAR: Meta-review is only mandatory when recommending rejection, optional for acceptance
  - consider reviews, rebuttals and how well authors’ rebuttal address the reviewers’ concerns
  - Avoid raising new critiques unless they can be justified to be fatal flaws overlooked
  - position all rebuttal papers

- Recommendations:
  - Ranking of rebuttal papers
  - Rejection & Acceptance
  - Recommend additional Oral papers and award candidates from the accepted rebuttal papers and categorize them (for sessions)
  - Rate reviews
AC Final Meta-Reviews

- Meta-reviews are required for papers where you recommend rejection
- Meta-reviews are optional for accepted papers – these will be made public
- A rejected paper’s metareview should provide a brief but informative justification of your recommendation.
  - Do not simply rely on average of scores
- In case of deviation from the reviewers’ recommendations, provide concrete justifications
Ternary AC period

- Handle ties
Final AC Meeting

- Report summary of paper statistics
- Discuss oral programs
- Gather feedback and suggestions for next year
General remarks

- Reviews and meta-reviews of accepted papers will be public
- Reviewers will be back in the loop after rebuttal, but only to update reviews
- New this year: No discussion period
- Reserve time for the two phases: Mar 18 – May 6 and May 28 - June 10
- CMT emails can be flagged as spam. Check the AC information on the website https://conferences.miccai.org/2024/en/INSTRUCTIONS-TO-AREA-CHAIRS.html and keep an eye on unresponsive reviewers
- Throughout the process
  - Please check the MICCAI Review Process and AC guidelines (website)
  - For questions on CMT, ask Kitty Wong submission@miccai2024.org
  - Contact Program Chairs at program_chairs@miccai2024.org (or via CMT)
Q&A