# CMT Tips for Meta-review of rebuttal papers:

1. You will now see, once logged into the CMT system, both the original ~18 papers that were assigned to you as Primary Meta-reviewer and an additional ~14 papers assigned to you as Secondary Meta-reviewer. Use the filter function in the "Chair Note/Status" column to filter papers based on their status. For example, type "Rebuttal" to select only papers invited for rebuttal. (Item 1 in screenshot#1)

2. In the "My Tag" column, you are tagged as the "Primary Meta-reviewer" for papers that were originally assigned to you. If there is no tag, then this paper is assigned to you after the rebuttal phase for which you are now serving as the secondary AC. (Item 2 in screenshot #1)

3. Rebuttal is submitted as "Author Feedback" in CMT. Click the "***View Author Feedback***" link in the "Discussion & Feedback" column to view. (Item 3 in screenshot #1).

4. **New this year** We have invited authors of accepted papers to optionally respond to the reviews and meta-review. You can view these responses via the "Author feedback" as well.

5. The meta-review from the primary AC as well as the paper rank in the primary AC's stack of papers is also visible to you. Click "***all meta-reviews***" to view or you can click "***All Reviewing Details***" to view all reviews, meta-reviews, and all discussion pertaining to the paper.

6. You can engage in a discussion in CMT with the other Meta-reviewers assigned to the same paper. Click the **"Post message"** link in the Discussion & Feedback to start a conversation. Once a new message is posted, an email notification will be sent to all meta-reviewers of the paper. The **"Post message"** link will change to **"View/Post messages (1)"** to indicate one message has been posted. Please note that reviewers of the paper can view the messages you post but will not be able to respond or post new messages. In this discussion phase, your name will not be visible to other meta-reviewers or reviewers. (See item 4 in screenshot #1 and screenshot #2 on details to post message)

7. If you want to ask clarifying questions to one of the reviewers, you can do so by clicking the envelope icon beside the reviewer to send an email to the reviewer.

8. Enter your final decision via "***Edit Meta-review***" link (item 5) if you are the primary AC of this paper. Use "***Enter Meta-review***" (item 6) if you are the secondary AC. Please note that you will not be able to modify the answers for the first 11 questions in the meta-review form. **Scroll down to the bottom and submit your response for questions 12 to 18**. Make sure you save your meta-review when you are done.

9. Please rate the quality of the reviews. This is important to help us acknowledge outstanding reviewers and to improve our reviewer pool for next year. When you have clicked on "View Reviews", use the "**Rate Review**" option in the top right corner to do so.

Screenshot #1



| Paper ID ↑ | Title | Chair Note / Status | Subject Areas | | Review | | | | | | Meta-Reviewers | My Tags | Meta-Review | Discussion & Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Primary | Secondary | Reviewers | | Assigned | Completed | % Completed | | | | | |
| filter... Clear | filter... Clear | filter... Clear | filter... Clear | filter... Clear | filter... Clear | | e.g. <3 Clear | e.g. <3 Clear | e.g. <3 Clear | filter... Clear | click he | click here... Clear | | |

**1** (annotation on Chair Note / Status column)

Row 1:
- Status: Early Accept
- Primary: Surgical Visualization and Mixed, Augmented and Virtual Reality
- Secondary: Clinical applications - Abdomen; Image Registration; Image-Guided Interventions and Surgery; Modalities - CT; Modalities - MRI; Surgical Planning and Simulation; Visualisation in Biomedical Imaging
- Reviewers: Reviewer Q8 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q15 Q16
  - 7 3 4 4 1 0
  - 6 3 5 3 0 0
  - 9 1 5 4 1 1
- Assigned: 3
- Completed: 3 View Reviews
- % Completed: 100%
- Meta-Reviewers: Meta-Reviewer Q3; MetaReviewer #1 ✉ 1
- My Tags: Primary Meta-Reviewer
- Meta-Review: ID: Meta-Reviewer #1 · View Meta-Review
- Discussion & Feedback: All Meta-Reviews; Post Message(s); All Reviewing Details; Status: Provisional Accept; **accepted paper, please check public author response** (yellow box)

Row 2:
- Status: Rebuttal
- Primary: Image-Guided Interventions and Surgery
- Secondary: Clinical applications - Abdomen; Surgical Data Science; Surgical Visualization and Mixed, Augmented and Virtual Reality
- Reviewers: Reviewer Q8 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q15 Q16
  - (Mr) ✉ 6 2 3 3 0 0
  - ✉ 7 2 3 3 0 0
  - ✉ 4 2 3 4 0
- Assigned: 3
- Completed: 3 View Reviews
- % Completed: 100%
- Meta-Reviewers: Meta-Reviewer Q3; MetaReviewer #3 ✉; MetaReviewer #1 ✉ 0; MetaReviewer #4 ✉
- My Tags: Primary Meta-Reviewer **2**
- Meta-Review: ID: Meta-Reviewer #1 · Edit Meta-Review **5** · View Meta-Review
- Discussion & Feedback: All Meta-Reviews; Post Message(s); All Reviewing Details; View Author Feedback **3**; Status: Rebuttal

Row 3:
- Status: Reject
- Primary: Surgical Visualization and Mixed, Augmented and Virtual Reality
- Secondary: (blank)
- Reviewers: Reviewer Q8 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q15 Q16
  - (UFRGS) ✉ 2 2 3 4 0
  - ✉ 3 2 4 3 0 0
  - of Technology) ✉
  - University) ✉ 6 4 4 4 0 0
- Assigned: 3
- Completed: 3 View Reviews
- % Completed: 100%
- Meta-Reviewers: Meta-Reviewer Q3; MetaReviewer #2 ✉ -1
- My Tags: Primary Meta-Reviewer
- Meta-Review: ID: Meta-Reviewer #2 · View Meta-Review
- Discussion & Feedback: All Meta-Reviews; Post Message(s); All Reviewing Details; Status: Reject; **Rejected paper, no action is required.** (green box)

Row 4:
- Status: Rebuttal
- Primary: Image-Guided Interventions and Surgery
- Secondary: Clinical applications - Abdomen; Surgical Data Science; Surgical Visualization and Mixed, Augmented and Virtual Reality
- Reviewers: Reviewer Q8 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q15 Q16
  - (Mr) ✉ 6 2 3 3 0 0
  - ✉ 7 2 3 3 0 0
  - ✉ 4 2 3 4 0
- Assigned: 3
- Completed: 3 View Reviews
- % Completed: 100%
- Meta-Reviewers: Meta-Reviewer Q3; MetaReviewer #1 ✉ 0; MetaReviewer #2 ✉; MetaReviewer #3 ✉
- My Tags: (blank)
- Meta-Review: ID: Meta-Reviewer #2 · Enter Meta-Review **6**
- Discussion & Feedback: All Meta-Reviews; Post Message(s) **4**; All Reviewing Details; Status: Rebuttal

Screenshot #2

**Discussion**

| Paper ID | 1 |
|---|---|
| Paper Title | my test paper |
| Track | MICCAI2021 |

| Reviewer | Q8 | Q10 | Q11 | Q12 | Q15 | Q16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reviewer #2 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

Download Paper   Show Reviews

[Create New Topic]   **1. Click here to create a new topic**

| Type text here and then press Enter to search | | Sort by: | Time↓ | First Name | Last Name |

Go Back to Meta-Reviewer Console

---

**Discussion**

| Paper ID | 1 |
|---|---|
| Paper Title | my test paper |
| Track | MICCAI2021 |

| Reviewer | Q8 | Q10 | Q11 | Q12 | Q15 | Q16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reviewer #2 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

Download Paper   Show Reviews

[Create New Topic]

| Type text here and then press Enter to search | | Sort by: | Time↓ | First Name | Last Name |

**MICCAI 2021**   *Date: 2021-05-14 17:29:43*
Topic:Topic Test
This is a test message

↱ Reply   **5. Click here to reply to a specific topic or use the "Create New Topic link" above to start a new topic**

---

**New Topic**
Title:

| Topic Test |   **2. enter your topic here**

Text:

| This is a test message

  **3. Type your message here**
|

[Post]  [Cancel]   **4. Click Post**

| Type text here and then press Enter to search | | Sort by: | Time↓ | First Name | Last Name |

Go Back to Meta-Reviewer Console

**12. Please confirm that you consent to this metareview being made publicly available (without disclosing your name) if the paper is accepted and that you have read and understood the MICCAI 2021 Area Chair Guidelines https://miccai2021.org/en/AREA-CHAIR-GUIDELINES.html and that you agree to follow these guidelines in the MICCAI 2021 review process. ***

☐ I agree

**13. Please provide your assessment of the paper taking all information into account, including rebuttal. Highlight the key strengths and weaknesses of the paper, clarify how you reconciled contrasting review comments and scores, indicate if concerns were successfully addressed in the rebuttal, and provide a clear justification of your decision. If you disagree with some of the (meta)reviewer statements, you can indicate so in your meta-review. Please make sure that the authors, program chairs, and the public can understand the reason for your decision. ***

8000 characters left

**14. After you have reviewed the rebuttal, please provide your final rating based on all reviews and the authors' rebuttal. ***

○ Accept
○ Reject

**15. If you recommend acceptance, is the paper's quality and content suitable for an oral presentation?**
**(Invisible to authors and reviewers) ***

○ Yes
○ No

**16. If the author indicated that they are eligible for a Young Scientist Award, would you like to nominate this work? Please take also reviewers' views on the suitability for this award into account.**

Please take also reviewers' views on the suitability for this award into account.

**(Invisible to authors and reviewers) ***

○ Yes
○ No

**17. What is the rank of this paper among all your rebuttal papers? Use a number between 1 (best paper in your stack) and n (worst paper in your stack of n papers). ***

125 characters left

**18. Confidential Comments to Program Chairs**

8000 characters left

Submit    Cancel