



## Paper Verification and Reviewer assignment Tasks for Primary Program Committee Members

We ask you to perform 2 sets of tasks in this order:

- By Wednesday **March 13<sup>th</sup>** 23:59 PST (Pacific Standard Time): check the formatting and the conflicts of interest with the assigned papers.
- By Friday **March 15<sup>th</sup>** 23:59 PST: make initial assignments of at least 3 external reviewers for each paper.
- By Tuesday **March 19<sup>th</sup>** 23:59 PST: finalize assignments of at least 3 external reviewers for each paper.

### 1.0 Paper Checking

Conflicts of interest and paper formatting issues have been lightly checked by the chairs for all papers. A thorough verification is necessary before the papers are distributed to external reviewers.

For each paper assigned to you as primary PC Member (appearing on the PCS site under the title “Submissions to Coordinate (as Primary )” ), we ask you to perform the following checks by **March 13<sup>th</sup>** :

- **Check if you have any conflict of interest** with the papers that were assigned to you as a primary PC Member.
- You have a conflict of interest if any of the following is true: you belong to the same institution, you co-authored together in the past 5 years, you hold a grant together, you have applied for a grant together, you currently collaborate, you plan to collaborate, you have a business partnership, you are relatives, or you have a close personal relationship.
- **Check if the authors have followed the guidelines for authors.** You should browse through the pdfs of the papers and verify the following points :
  - Have the authors used the LNCS format?
  - Is the paper within the 8 pages limit?
  - Have they removed the names of authors and institutions?
  - Have they removed the names of colleagues or collaborating partners in the text and in the acknowledgement section (if applicable)?
  - Have they avoided to explicit and unambiguous references to their prior work in the paper?

- Check if there is a **conflict of interest for the secondary PC Members** to make recommendations of this paper. Only primary PC can do this since secondary PC members do not know the identity of the authors. You can view the secondary PC members associated with each paper by clicking on “Manage Reviewers” next to each paper.
- Check if the **content of supplementary material**.
  - Is the content of the material valid?
  - Does it reveal the names of the authors?
  - Is it trying to circumvent the page limit in a non-acceptable way?

If you find a conflict of interest or a formatting issue, send an email immediately to [miccai2013-chairs@mori.m.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp](mailto:micca2013-chairs@mori.m.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp) . In case of conflict of interest, Program Chairs will re-assign the paper to another PC Member. Any serious violation of the guidelines for authors will result in rejection of the paper.

## 2.0 Assigning Reviewers

After having checked the content of the paper, you can start working on the assignment of reviewers.

### 2.1 Two rounds of assignments

Your main task as a primary PC member is to assign each paper at least 3 external reviewers. The assignment is performed in two rounds:

- A first round when you propose an initial reviewer assignment of papers but no information is sent to the reviewers. After **March 15<sup>th</sup> 23:59 PST**, the reviewers will be asked to log on the system and select the papers they want to review.
- In a second round, after **March 15<sup>th</sup> 23:59 PST**, you can modify the reviewer assignment for each paper depending on the acceptance / refusal of reviewers to your initial assignments. All reviewer assignments have to be completed before **March 19<sup>th</sup> 23:59 PST**.

It is highly recommended **to invite more than 3 reviewers in the first round** to make sure you get 3 reviewers who agree after March 15<sup>th</sup>.

This process allows the Chairs to tackle the anonymity and format issues before the papers are sent for review. It also avoids having a rush to the “experienced reviewers” in the first few hours following the opening of the review assignment phase.

### 2.2 Selecting Reviewers

After having overviewed each paper, you have 3 options for selecting external reviewers:

1. Selecting the ones that come to your mind knowing the topic of the paper. For instance, the list of references at the end of the paper may provide relevant names as reviewers.
2. Selecting them from the list of reviewers that are already registered on the reviewing site. There are currently 842 registered external reviewers who have been proposed by 2013 MICCAI PC members or verified by 2012 MICCAI PC members. The system proposes a nice interface to select registered reviewers based on keywords (see below). Each external reviewer has volunteered for a number of reviews (in

average 4 reviews), but you may still offer them to review more papers than they volunteered for.

3. Selecting them from the list of reviewers proposed by the authors. You have to consider this list with great care, as it has not been checked. In particular verify the potential conflicts of interests with the authors and the relevance of the topics. This information should be seen as a **backup solution to select reviewers**.

In all cases, you must avoid conflicts of interest between authors and reviewers (see definition above). Finally, do not assign PC members as reviewers as they are not performing any external reviews.

### 2.3 Assigning Reviewers in the review system

#### *Adding / removing a registered reviewer*

After log in, you should go to “*reviews in progress*” then “*Review for MICCAI 2013 (as PC Member)*” to see the list of submissions that have been assigned to you as Primary PC member. Clicking on the link “Manage reviewers” next to each paper will provide the main page for assigning reviewers.

To add or remove a reviewer to a paper, simply type his/her name on the text box “Name” and click on “Assign” (to add) or “Unassign” (to remove).

If the reviewer has already registered, then his name will be added to the list of reviewers.

#### *Adding a non registered reviewer*

If the reviewer was not registered, then you can register him/her on your own. To this end, the page indicating that the proposed reviewer name is not in the reviewer database, has a link “register a new person”. Click on the link and provide the given name (first name), last name and email of the reviewer you want to assign. The reviewer will receive an invitation to review and upon acceptance will be added to your list.

#### *Selecting a registered reviewer from a list of keywords*

To select a reviewer from a list of keywords click on “Show All Reviewers”. You can rank the reviewers according to the keywords chosen by the authors. You may only select the primary keyword to get a larger choice or you may also select secondary keywords to narrow it down. For each registered reviewer, you may look at the number of free slots to review, the match score of keywords and the homepage of each reviewer. The assignment is then performed by clicking on the button “assign” next to each reviewer’s name.

It is strongly advised to check the expertise of the reviewer with respect to the paper’s topics as the keywords may not be relevant.

## 3.0 MICCAI Review Process

We provide below a reminder of the MICCAI review process.

The review is performed by two committees:

- **External Reviewers** provide an evaluation for a limited number of papers (around 4 papers per reviewer on average), each paper assigned to at least 3 external

reviewers. The reviewers are recruited by the program chairs, and their competence is carefully verified in consultation with PC members and senior MICCAI scientists.

- **Program Committee (PC) Members** assign external reviewers and make final recommendations for a subset of submitted papers. The list of PC members can be found on the conference web site.

Each PC member acts both as a Primary and a Secondary PC member:

- **Primary PC Member assigns the external reviewers.** He/She knows the identity of the authors and manages the assignment of reviewers for 7 to 9 papers (4 papers for some people). (He/She leads the discussion process with the external reviewers. Primary PC member needs to ensure at least three solid reviews for each of his/her Primary papers, but does not make any recommendation or decision about these papers.
- **Secondary PC Member makes recommendation.** He/She does not know the identity of the authors and makes a recommendation for 14 to 18 papers (8 papers for some people), which are a different set from his/her Primary papers. Each paper discussed at the PC meeting will have 2 independent recommendations from secondary PC members.

**Note that terms “Primary” and “Secondary” do not represent their intuitive meanings. They just mean two different roles. Separating the above two roles may look complicated, but ensures to eliminate the bias in the recommendation of PC members by knowing the identity of the authors as much as possible.**

The outline of the process and expected timeline is as follows:

- **Assignment of PC Members (March 2nd - March 10th).** Paper submission has closed. Each paper is assigned to one Primary PC Member and two Secondary PC members. The Primary and Secondary PC members are assigned based on the preferences of the author and the subject matter of the paper, both entered by the author in the paper submission form.
- **Assignment of External Reviewers by Primary PC members (March 11th- March 19th).** The Primary PC member assigns at least three external reviewers to evaluate the paper. These reviewers need to be selected by taking the conflicts of interest into account, by making sure that they are from different organizations and different regions/countries and finally that they include at least one senior researcher or highly expert in the subject. Primary PC members are asked not to only rely on keywords for selecting the reviewers and make additional efforts to ensure that they are the right peer reviewers for given papers.
- **Review by External Reviewers (March 15th - April 5th).** External reviewers work on their review without knowing the identity of authors. The Primary PC member monitors the build-up of reviews and contact reviewers if their reviews lack in content or tone.
- **Early rejection (April 12th).** The papers for which all reviewers recommend rejection are rejected with no further consideration. External reviews of those papers are sent to the authors.

- **Rebuttal Submission (April 12th - April 16th).** For the remaining papers, the authors receive the external reviews and are invited to submit a short rebuttal.
- **Discussion among External Reviewers (moderated by Primary PC members) (April 12th - April 21st).** The Primary PC member engages reviewers in a discussion, urges them to update their reviews, and produces a brief report about their discussion. The discussion consists of two stages, review sharing and rebuttal evaluation. During the first stage, the reviews for each paper are shared among the external reviewers, based on which they have discussion. The reviews must not be updated at this stage. At the second stage (after April 17th), rebuttals are sent to the Primary PC member and the external reviewers who carefully study the rebuttal and have further discussion. Based on the discussion, the external reviewers have to update their reviews (if needed). The purpose of discussion is not to reach a consensus among the reviewers but to eliminate misunderstanding and strengthen the reviews. Throughout the entire process, the Primary PC member refrains from influencing the external reviewers in expressing their unbiased and anonymous professional opinion.
- **Recommendation from Secondary PC members (April 22nd - May 3rd).** For each paper, the two Secondary PC members consider the external reviews, rebuttal, and discussion report and make a recommendation about acceptance or rejection of the paper and may also recommend the paper for oral presentation and awards. In making the recommendation, Secondary PC members do not know the identity of the authors and the external reviewers.
- **Final Decisions (May 4th - May 19th).** The program chairs compile all recommendations and the Program Committee finalizes decisions about acceptance or rejection, oral talks and award nominations during the PC meeting that will take place in Tokyo on May 11-12, 2013. The award winners are decided later by the MICCAI award committee chaired by a designated board member.
- **Notification of acceptance (May 20th).** The authors are notified about the decision. They will receive the anonymous reviews, without identifying the Secondary PC member and external reviewers. In case of a procedural error, the authors may submit a formal complaint to the Program Chairs who will promptly investigate the case.
- **Preparation of camera-ready (May 21st - June 6th).** The accepted papers must be finalized for publication in the proceedings. Final papers are due before June 6th 2013. Papers not received by this deadline will not be included in the program.

## MICCAI 2013 Program Chairs

Yoshinobu Sato  
Christian Barillot  
Nassir Navab

## MICCAI 2013 General Chairs

Kensaku Mori  
Ichiro Sakuma