


Area Chair Guidelines Phase 2

MICCAI 2019 Area Chairs Reviewer monitoring – Phase 2

Dear Area Chairs

Your task for the next three weeks is to monitor the progress of the reviews of the papers that have been assigned to you.

Reviews from reviewers are due May 24th. Once all the reviews are in, complete the meta-review by May 28th.

To do this, go into the CMT system as meta reviewer, and you will see the list of papers under your purview in the “Title” Column and the list of reviewers assigned to the paper in the “Reviewers” column. (Some will have hyperlinks to their Google profiles) Your task is to make sure the review process remains on track, so feel free to email reviewers who are lagging. From the “Action” and “More” buttons, you have options to email either all of the reviewers, those who have not completed their review. To email the individual reviewer, use the  icon next to the reviewer’s name.

Note that you can hide selected columns by hovering over the “Hide” button at the top right of each column. You can restore hidden columns by clicking the “Restore Columns” button on the top row.

To see the reviews of the papers, click on “View reviews” in the “Completed” column.

There are several changes from previous years.

Reviewers rate papers according to numerical scores (that you can see in item 13 in the Screenshots below).

Also you must give each review a rating (Exceeded Expectations; Met expectations; Failed to meet expectations - Item 15 in screenshots below)

Note also that we have added specific guidelines for MIC and CAI papers this year.

MIC-based papers

When reviewing MIC based MICCAI papers, we would like to see

- 1) whether the proposed methods are innovative or
- 2) whether the application is innovative.

These are the two important criteria for accepting or rejected those submitted papers.

In particular the following questions should be asked when evaluating MIC papers:

1. Is the topic of paper clinically significant?
2. Do the authors clearly explain data collection, processing, and division methods?
 - One important thing is to check whether the cross-validation is performed from the beginning of preprocessing steps, instead of the final stage of decision making.
3. Do the **data** appropriately represent the range of possible patients and disease manifestations?
4. Are the **data labels** (if applicable) of sufficient quality to support the claimed performance of the algorithms?
5. Do the authors report a sufficient number and type of **performance measures** to accurately represent strengths and weaknesses of the algorithms?
Are performance measures reported with confidence intervals?
6. Does the work make a significant contribution to the field, or is it just incremental over previous work?
7. Do the authors discuss **limitations** of their methods and **directions** for future research

CAI-based papers.

This year we have particularly encouraged submissions to MICCAI of papers relating to both the implementation of, and training for, computer-assisted Intervention approaches. In particular, we wish to highlight the use of Medical Image Computing techniques that have become integral components of Computer-Assisted Intervention. Areas that are considered significant in a CAI paper include.

1. Presentation of a device or technology that has potential clinical significance.
2. Demonstration of clinical feasibility, even on a single subject/animal/phantom.
3. Demonstration of robust system integration and phantom validation.
4. A novel MIC approach to solve an unmet CAI need.
5. Proposal of a cost-effective (frugal technology) approach to implementing an otherwise expensive CAI solution.
6. Description of a system or device that is robustly validated against appropriate performance metrics
7. Psychophysical/Human factors evaluations of CAI systems are presented.
8. All papers should discuss imitations of proposed systems and provide a clear description of how the data used for the study were acquired.

For papers for which all reviews are complete, click the **“Enter Meta-Review”** button to complete your review. When your reviews are complete, you may choose **“Edit/View Meta Review”** from the link in the Meta Review Column to edit or view your review.

The ultimate score, which will determine acceptance or rejection of the paper, is a combination of the ranking of the individual scores from the reviewers, and the experience of the reviewers. For your convenience we have listed the responses to questions 11 and 12 numerically, with Question 11 giving the overall opinion of the paper expressed as number in the range 0-10 (10 being highest score), and Question 12 giving the reviewer expertise in the range 1-4 (4 highest). These results are shown in the Q11 and Q12 columns of the Meta Review page. 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.

After all Meta-reviews have been completed, and rebuttals received, there will be a conference call, tentatively in the week June 24 – June 29, with your regional PC Chair (Asia, Europe, Americas), to finalize the final scoring and rankings.

Navigating the screens:

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

Screen 2

8. Actions available for “Action” button
9. Actions available for “More” button
10. When reviews are being uploaded you can click here to see them
11. If the meta-review is complete, you can view and edit here.
12. You can hide columns by hovering mouse and clicking here. After columns have been hidden, a “Column Restore” button will appear if you need to restore it again.
13. Overall opinion and reviewer expertise values

Screen 3


14. You can review all reviews by clicking the “Action” button, and you have the option for a side-by-side view, or a printer-friendly view.
15. After clicking on view review button (10) you will have the option to rate all of the reviewers using the “Rate Reviewer” button.

Meta-Reviewer Console

Please [Click Here](#) to view Welcome Message & Instructions

Meta-Reviewing

1 - 25 of 25 [Filters] Show: 23 [30] [100] [All] **Actions**

Paper ID	Title	Region	Subject Areas		Suggestions	Review				Meta-Reviewers	Meta-Review	Discussion & Feedback	Review Rating				Please State Your Overall Opinion Of The Paper.				Please Rate Your Expertise With Respect To This Work. (Not Visible To Authors)				Actions	
			Primary	Secondary		Reviewers	Assigned	Completed	% Completed				Completed	% Completed	Min	Max	Avg	Spread	Min	Max	Avg	Spread				
			Clear	filter...		filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...				filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...		
	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ Show Abstract 		Interventional Imaging Systems	Optical and Photo-acoustic Imaging	1 - Iyas uyanik (iyasuyanik@yahoo.com) 2 - Haichong Zhang (hzhang10@epi.edu) 3 - Lin Gu (ling@ni.ac.jp) 4 - Bilal Malik (bilal.malik@qultraound.com) 5 - Yan Hu (huyan@nirma.ac.cn) 6 - Fai Bao (gbao@shanghaitech.edu.cn) 7 - Shanshan Liang (shangsh@mail.sysu.edu.cn) 8 - Wenteng Xia (wenteng.xia@kcl.ac.uk) 9 - Jonathan McLeod (jonathan.mcleod@mbusung.com) 10 - Marco Esposito (marco.esposito@tum.de)	Reviewer Q11 Q12 Jonathan McLeod (Intensive Surgical) Iyas uyanik (University of Houston) Wenteng Xia (King's College London)	3	0	0%	Meta-Reviewer MetaReviewer #2	ID: Meta-Reviewer #2 	All Meta-Reviews Status: Awaiting Decision	0	0%												More
	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ Show Abstract		Image Reconstruction and Image Quality	Interventional Imaging Systems ; Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence	1 - Sanketh Vedula (sanketh@cs.technion.ac.il) 2 - Xiao Chen (xiao-chen@siemens-healthineers.com) 3 - Yixing Huang (yixing.yh.huang@fu.de) 4 - Andreas Hauptmann (a.hauptmann@ucl.ac.uk) 5 - Valery Vishnevskiy (vishnevskiy@biomed.ee.ethz.ch) 6 - Holger Kurze (holger.h.kurze@siemens-healthineers.com) 7 - Viswanath PS (psvish@cse.itb.ac.in) 8 - Jingjing Jiao (j.jiao@ucl.ac.uk) 9 - Mingli Zhang (mingli.zhang@mcgill.ca)	Reviewer Q11 Q12 Viswanath PS (Indian Institute of Technology (IT) Bombay) Holger Kurze (Siemens Healthineers) Kai Wang (Sun Yat-sen University)	3	0	0%	Meta-Reviewer MetaReviewer #2	ID: Meta-Reviewer #2 	All Meta-Reviews Status: Awaiting Decision	0	0%												More

1

2

4

3

5

6

7

Meta-Reviewer Console

Please click here to view Welcome Message & Instructions

Meta-Reviewing

Paper ID	Title	Region	Subject Areas		Suggestions	Review				Meta-Reviewers	Meta-Review	Discussion & Feedback	Review Rating				Please State Your Overall Opinion Of The Paper.				Expected This Year		
			Primary	Secondary		Reviewers	Assigned	Completed	% Completed				Completed	% Completed	Min	Max	Avg	Spread	Min	Max		Avg	Spread
[Redacted]	[Redacted]				1 - Ilyas uyanik (ilyasuyanik@yahoo.com) 2 - Haichong Zhang (hzhang10@wpi.edu) 3 - Lin Gu (ling@nl.ac.jp) 4 - Bilal Malik (bilal.malik@qultrasound.com) 5 - Yan Hu (nyuan@rimta.ac.cn) 6 - Fei Gao (fgao@shanghaiitech.edu.cn) 7 - Shanshan Liang (liangssn@mail.sysu.edu.cn) 8 - Wenfeng Xia (wenfeng.xia@kcl.ac.uk) 9 - Jonathan McLeod (jonathan.mcleod@ntusurg.com) 10 - Marco Esposito (marco.esposito@tum.de)	Reviewer Q11 Q12 Jonathan McLeod (Jonathan McLeod) [View Profile] Ilyas uyanik (University of Houston) [View Profile] Wenfeng Xia (King's College London) [View Profile]	3	0	0%	Meta-Reviewer MetaReviewer #2 [View Profile]	ID: (Meta-Reviewer #2) [View Profile] Enter Meta-Review	All Meta-Reviews Status: Awaiting Decision	0	0%									
[Redacted]	[Redacted]				1 - Sanketh Vedula (sanketh@cs.technion.ac.il) 2 - Xiao Chen (xiao-chen@siemens-healthineers.com) 3 - Yixing Huang (yixing.yh.huang@fau.de) 4 - Andreas Hauptmann (a.hauptmann@ucl.ac.uk) 5 - Valery Vishnevskiy (vishnevskiy@biomed.oe.ethz.ch) 6 - Holger Kurze (holger.kurze@siemens-healthineers.com) 7 - Viswanath PS (psvish@cse.its.ac.in) 8 - Jiaojing Jiao (jjiao@ucl.ac.uk)	Reviewer Q11 Q12 Viswanath PS (Indian Institute of Technology Bombay) [View Profile] Holger Kurze (Siemens Healthineers) [View Profile] Kai Wang (Tsinghua University) [View Profile]	3	2	0%	Meta-Reviewer MetaReviewer #2 [View Profile]	ID: (Meta-Reviewer #2) [View Profile] Edit Meta-Review View Meta-Review	All Meta-Reviews Status: Awaiting Decision	0	0%									

Hide

12

Download Files
View All Reviews
Import Meta-Reviews
Email Reviewers

8

Edit Suggestions
Edit Assignments
Invite Reviewer
View Invite
Email Senior Meta-Reviewer
Email Reviewers

9

2 View Reviews

10

10 4
6 3
7 2

13

Edit Meta-Review
View Meta-Review

11

& Instructions

1 - 25 of 25

« « 1 » »

Show:

25

50

100

All

Clear All Filters

Restore Columns

Actions

Suggestions	Review				Meta-Reviewers	Meta-Review	Discussion & Feedback	Completed	Completed	Spread	Please Rate Your Expertise With Respect To This Work. (Not Visible To Authors)				Actions
	Reviewers	Assigned	Completed	% Completed							Min	Max	Avg	Spread	
<input type="text" value="filter..."/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="filter..."/>	<input type="text" value="click here..."/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	<input type="text" value="e.g. <3"/>	

- Download Files
- View All Reviews
- Import Meta-Reviews
- Email Reviews

14

View Reviews

Print

Paper ID [redacted]
Paper Title [redacted]

Reviewer #1 [redacted]

Rate Review:

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

15

Questions
1. Please confirm that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2019 Reviewers' Guide <http://www.miccai2019.org/information/information-reviewers/>
Agreement accepted

Reviewer #2 [redacted]

Rate Review: Not rated

15

Questions
1. Please confirm that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2019 Reviewers' Guide <http://www.miccai2019.org/information/information-reviewers/>
Agreement accepted

Reviewer #3 [redacted]

Rate Review: Not rated

15

Questions
1. Please confirm that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2019 Reviewers' Guide <http://www.miccai2019.org/information/information-reviewers/>
Agreement accepted