

MICCAI 2020 Area Chairs Reviewer monitoring and Meta-review

Dear Area Chairs:

Your tasks for the next two 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 22th. Emails to remind reviewers to submit will be sent out centrally by the CMT platform manager.
2. Please complete the meta-review by May 12th. Guidance on approximate # papers to be accepted/rejected/sent for rebuttal will be sent out shortly after the review deadline has passed.

There are several changes from previous years.

Reviewers will rate papers according to numerical scores (that you can see in item 11 in the Screenshots below).

You must give each review a rating (Exceeded Expectations; Met expectations; Failed to meet expectations - Item 18 in screenshots below). This help us identify bad reviewers and to improve the selection of reviewers for future meetings.

Note also that we have added specific review guidelines for MIC and CAI papers, please see <https://miccai2020.org/en/REVIEWER-GUIDELINES.html#nav-02>

Useful CMT Tips:

1. For papers where you have not yet entered meta-review, you will only see the "Enter Meta-Review" (item 7 in screenshot #1) option in the meta-review column. You must hit the "submit" button at the end of the form when you are done entering your meta-review.
2. For papers where you have already entered meta-reviews, you will see two options: "Edit Meta-Review" and "View Meta-Review" (item 13 in screenshot #2) in the meta-review column.
3. For your convenience, your recommendation for each paper (provisional accept, rebuttal, provisional reject) will be displayed in the meta-reviewer column. (see item 14 in screenshot #2)
4. We have displayed the reviewer responses to questions 9 and 11 numerically in the reviewer column, with Question 9 giving the overall opinion of the paper expressed as number in the range 0-10 (10 being highest score), and Question 11 giving the reviewer expertise in the range 1-5 (5 highest). You may use these values to help you weight the scores from the various reviewers, as you arrive at an overall assessment of the paper.

Navigating the CMT:

Below are several screenshots of the Meta-Reviewer screen.

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 particular paper.
4. Individual paper download.
5. Action button (see next screen for popup menu #8 below).
6. More button (see next screen for popup menu #9 below).
7. Enter your review here

The screenshot shows the 'Meta-Reviewer Console' interface. At the top, a navigation bar includes 'Help Center', 'Select Your Role: Meta-Reviewer' (circled with a red box and labeled '1'), and 'MICCAI2020'. Below the navigation bar, there is a 'Meta-Reviewing' button (labeled '2') and a 'Please click here to view Welcome Message & Instructions' link (circled with a red box). The main content area is a table with columns for Paper ID, Title, Subject Areas, Review, Meta-Reviewers, Meta-Review, Discussion & Feedback, Review Rating, and Actions. The table contains two rows of data. The first row is for a paper with ID 'Q9' and 'Q11'. The 'Review' column shows 'Assigned: 3', 'Completed: 0', and '% Completed: 0%'. The 'Meta-Reviewers' column lists 'Sarah Ostadabbas (Northeastern University)', 'Omid Haji Maghsoudi (University of Pennsylvania)', and 'Bo Wang (Tencent America)'. The 'Meta-Review' column shows 'ID: Meta-Reviewer #5' and a button 'Enter Meta-Review' (circled with a red box and labeled '7'). The 'Discussion & Feedback' column shows 'Status: Awaiting Decision'. The 'Review Rating' column shows 'Completed: 0' and '% Completed: 0%'. The 'Actions' column has a 'More' button (circled with a red box and labeled '6'). The second row is for a paper with ID 'Q9' and 'Q11'. The 'Review' column shows 'Assigned: 3', 'Completed: 0', and '% Completed: 0%'. The 'Meta-Reviewers' column lists 'Stephen Thompson (UCL)', 'Housseem-Eddine Gueziri (McGill University)', and 'Bongjin Koo (University College London)'. The 'Meta-Review' column shows 'ID: Meta-Reviewer #1' and a button 'Enter Meta-Review'. The 'Discussion & Feedback' column shows 'Status: Awaiting Decision'. The 'Review Rating' column shows 'Completed: 0' and '% Completed: 0%'. The 'Actions' column has a 'More' button. At the bottom right, there is a 'Clear All Filters' button and an 'Actions' dropdown menu (circled with a red box and labeled '5').

Screen 2

8. Actions available for **"Action"** button. Use the "download" option to download all papers at once.
9. Actions available for **"More"** button.
10. When reviews are being uploaded you can click here to see them. Please rate each individual review (See screenshot 3).
11. Reviewer's responses to Questions 9 and 11 (Overall opinion and reviewer expertise values) are displayed here.
12. Statistics of reviewer's responses to Questions 9 and 11 are displayed here.
13. If the meta-review is complete, you can view and edit here.
14. Your recommendation is displayed here.
15. If you have finished rating your reviewers, your progress will be shown here
16. You can hide columns by hovering mouse and clicking **"hide"**. After columns have been hidden, a **"Column Restore"** button will appear if you need to restore it again.

Meta-Reviewer Console

Please click [here](#) to view Welcome Message & Instructions

Meta-Reviewing

The screenshot displays the Meta-Reviewer Console interface. At the top, there are navigation controls including '1 - 6 of 6', 'Show: 25', and 'Restore Columns'. Below this is a table with columns: Paper ID, Title, Subject Areas (Primary/Secondary), Review (Reviewers, Assigned, Completed, % Completed), Meta-Reviewers (Meta-Reviewer, Q3, Provisional Rejection), Meta-Review (ID, Edit, View), Discussion & Feedback (Status), Review Rating (Completed, % Completed, Min, Max, Avg, Spread), and Actions (Download, View All Reviews, Import Meta-Reviews, Email Reviewers, More). A specific paper (ID 3054) is highlighted, showing reviewer ratings (6, 5) and a meta-review status of 'Provisional Rejection'. The 'Review Rating' column shows a '1' in the 'Completed' sub-column. The 'Actions' column contains a 'More' dropdown menu with options: 'Edit Suggestions', 'Email Reviewers', and 'Email Senior Meta-Reviewer'. Red boxes and numbers highlight specific elements: 8 (Actions menu), 9 (Email Reviewers), 10 (View Reviews), 11 (Reviewer ratings), 12 (Review Rating statistics), 13 (Edit/View Meta-Review), 14 (Provisional Rejection), 15 (Completed/Percentage), 16 (Hide button).

Screen 3

17. To rate reviews, click “view reviews”, and you will see an option to rate each review at the top right-hand corner of each review.

View Reviews



Paper ID 3054
Paper Title This is my test paper

Reviewer #1 (MICCAI 2020)

Rate Review

Exceeded Expectations
Not rated
Failed to Meet Expectations
Met Expectations
Exceeded Expectations

Questions

1. Please confirm that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2020 Reviewers' Guide <https://miccai2020.org/en/REVIEWER-GUIDELINES.html>
Agreement accepted
3. Please provide a summary of the paper (a few lines)
This is a great paper
4. Please list the major strengths of the paper; you should write about a novel formulation, an original way to use data, demonstration of clinical feasibility, a novel application, or anything else that is a strong aspect of this work (bulleted list)
the is a well written paper
5. Please list the major weaknesses of the paper (bulleted list).
Theres isn't
6. Please rate the clarity and organization of this paper
Good
7. Please provide detailed and constructive comments for the authors. Please also refer to our Reviewer's guide on what makes a good review: <https://miccai2020.org/en/REVIEWER-GUIDELINES.html>
No comments
8. Please rate level of scientific innovation.
Good
9. Please rate the contribution of the paper to clinical translation.
Good
10. Please state your overall opinion of the paper (not visible to authors). Make sure your opinion is supported by the arguments above.
Marginally above the acceptance threshold. I tend to vote for accepting this submission, but rejecting it would not be that bad. (6)
11. What were the major factors that led you to your overall score for this paper? (optional, not visible to authors)
This is such a well written paper
12. Please rate your expertise with respect to this work. (not visible to authors)
You are absolutely certain about your assessment. You are very familiar with the related work. (5)
13. Please state your role/position (not visible to authors)
PhD Student

17

Screen 4

18. 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".

Meta-Reviewing 1 - 1 of 1 « « 1 » » Show: 25 50 100 All Clear All Filters Actions ▾

Paper ID ↑	Title	Subject Areas		Review				Meta-Reviewers	Meta-Review	Discussion & Feedback	Review Rating									
		Primary	Secondary	Reviewers	Assigned	Completed	% Completed				Completed	% Completed	Min	Max	Avg	Spread	Min	Max	Avg	Spread
e.g. <3 <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>	e. <small>Clear</small>	e.ζ <small>Clear</small>	e.ι <small>Clear</small>	e.g. < <small>Clear</small>	e. <small>Clear</small>	e.ζ <small>Clear</small>	e.ι <small>Clear</small>	e.g. < <small>Clear</small>

18

Side by Side view for easy comparison

View All Reviews

Paper ID: 3054
 Paper Title: This is my test paper

	Reviewer #1	Reviewer #2	Reviewer #3
1. Please confirm that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2020 Reviewers' Guide https://miccai2020.org/en/REVIEWER-GUIDELINES.html	Agreement accepted		
3. Please provide a summary of the paper (a few lines)	This is a great paper		
4. Please list the major strengths of the paper; you should write about a novel formulation, an original way to use data, demonstration of clinical feasibility, a novel application, or anything else that is a strong aspect of this work (bulleted list)	the is a well written paper		
5. Please list the major weaknesses of the paper (bulleted list).	Theres isn't		
6. Please rate the clarity and organization of this paper	Good		
7. Please provide detailed and constructive comments for the authors. Please also refer to our Reviewer's guide on what makes a good review: https://miccai2020.org/en/REVIEWER-GUIDELINES.html	No comments		
8. Please rate level of scientific innovation.	Good		
9. Please rate the contribution of the paper to clinical translation.	Good		