

CMT Instructions for Area Chairs – Reviewer suggestions and reporting format violation

1. Log in to CMT (<https://cmt3.research.microsoft.com/MICCAI2021/Submission/Index>) using your user ID (the email address with “Meta-reviewer status”) and selecting your role as “Meta-Reviewer“, to check the papers allocated to you. (See Screenshot #1 below).
2. You can view the titles, abstracts, download individual papers or, under “Actions“, select “Download files” to download all papers including supplemental materials as a single archive. Please note there may be a small number of papers in your batch that may not be a perfect match, but the allocation has been optimized under the constraints of TPMS scores, subject areas, conflicts, overall numbers of papers and area chairs.
3. You can click on the Paper ID to view the submission summary of the paper, including the statement of Novelty/Impact, and their response to the reproducibility checklist.
4. Ignore the Review and Meta-review, columns for now. For each paper, select on the far right the “more” -> “Edit suggestions” menu to see the list of non-conflicting reviewers for the paper.

Screen-shot #1

Meta-Reviewer Console

Please click [here](#) to view Welcome Message & Instructions. You can hover over column headers and click “Hide” to remove columns.

The screenshot shows the Meta-Reviewer Console interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with "Meta-Reviewing" on the left and "1 - 1 of 1" on the right. Below this is a table with columns: Paper ID, Title, Subject Areas (Primary, Secondary), Suggestions, Reviewers, Assigned, Completed, % Completed, Meta-Reviewer Note, Meta-Review, Discussion & Feedback, Review Rating (Completed, % Completed), and Actions. The first row shows a paper with ID 1, titled "my test paper", with subject areas "Clinical applications" and "Abdomen". The "Assigned" column shows 0, "Completed" shows 0, and "% Completed" shows 0%. The "Meta-Reviewer Note" column has an "Add" button. The "Meta-Review" column has a button "ID: Meta-Reviewer #3" and "Enter Meta-Review". The "Review Rating" column shows 0% completed. The "Actions" column has a dropdown menu with options: "Edit Meta-Reviewer Note", "Edit Suggestions" (circled in red), and "Email Reviewers".

Paper ID	Title	Subject Areas		Suggestions	Review			Meta-Reviewer Note		Meta-Review	Discussion & Feedback	Review Rating		Actions
		Primary	Secondary		Reviewers	Assigned	Completed	% Completed	Entered?			List Any Serious Format Violation Here	Completed	
1	my test paper	Clinical applications	Abdomen			0	0	0%	Add	ID: Meta-Reviewer #3	Status: Awaiting Decision	0	0%	More

The list of reviewers is sorted in alphabetical order by default. You can search for reviewers by name. You can sort the list of reviewers according to their Relevance or their TPMS score (See Screenshot #2 below). Relevance is determined by the overlaps of the subject areas between the paper and the reviewer. This number ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 being least relevant and **1 being most relevant**. TPMS rank is determined by overlap of the keyword profiles extracted from the paper and the reviewer’s publications uploaded to TPMS, with **1 being the highest rank (best match)** and 1400 being the worst.

To sort all reviewers by Relevance, click on “Relevance” two times to sort in decreasing order (most to least relevant). To sort all reviewers by TPMS rank, click on “TPMS rank” once to sort in an increasing order (best match (1) to least (1400)).

Note that the results from the two sorting criteria may not always agree. **We suggest that you place more emphasis on the TPMS ranking**, noting however that not all reviewers have completed their TPMS profiles (<5% still missing). You can also click the link in the External Profile Column to view the Google Scholar or other profiles of the reviewer. Since these are the reviewers that you will potentially manage, it is important that you select the most appropriate reviewers for each paper.

Screen-shot #2

Edit Suggestions

SUBMISSION DETAILS

Paper ID: 1
 Paper Title: my test paper
 Primary Subject Area: Clinical applications - Abdomen

1 - 25 of 1379 [Navigation icons] [Show] 50 100 All Clear All Filters

Rank	First Name	Last Name	Email	Subject Areas		Relevance ↓	Tpms Rank	Bid	Assigned	Suggested	External Profile
				Primary	Secondary						
	e.g. filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	filter...	e.g. <3	e.g. click h	e.g. <3	e.g. <3		
	Kitty	Wong		Clinical applications - Abdomen	Computer Aided Diagnosis;Image Registration;Machine Learning - Domain adaptation;Machine Learning - Interpretability / Explainability;Machine Learning - Uncertainty;Modalities - other;Modalities - Video	0.80	1	Not Entered	0	0	GS DBLP Add
	Marleen	de Bruijne		Clinical applications - Abdomen	Clinical applications - Oncology;Computer Aided Diagnosis;Modalities - CT;Visualisation in Biomedical Imaging	0.80	2	Not Entered	0	0	GS S2 DBLP Add
	MICCAI	2021		Clinical applications - Abdomen	Clinical applications - Lung	0.80	3	Not Entered	0	0	GS Add
	Jianning	Li		Clinical applications - Abdomen	Clinical applications - Vascular;Computational Anatomy and Physiology;Computer Aided Diagnosis;Image Reconstruction;Image Registration;Image Segmentation;Machine Learning - Interpretability / Explainability;Machine Learning - Self-supervised learning;Machine Learning - Semi-supervised learning;Modalities - CT;Modalities - EEG/ECG;Modalities - MRI;Modalities - Ultrasound;Visualisation in	0.80	4	Not Entered	0	0	Add

- Please at least read the abstract of the paper to help you determine the best fit with reviewers, and suggest ***at least*** 10 potential reviewers for each paper, in a ranked order. Use the “Add” link on the right-hand column to add the reviewer to your list. These will appear in a list at the top of your page according to the order of your selection. You can reorder your selected list by using the arrow buttons in the right-hand column (Screen-shot #3 below). This final list should reflect how you rank each reviewer (most highly recommended reviewer to least recommended).

Screen-shot #3

Paper ID: 1
 Paper Title: my test paper
 Primary Subject Area: Clinical applications - Abdomen

CANDIDATE RANKING

Rank	First Name	Last Name	Email	TPMS Rank	Actions
1	Kitty	Wong	[REDACTED]	1	✖ ↑ ↓
2	Marleen	de Bruijne	[REDACTED]	2	✖ ↑ ↓
3	MICCAI	2021	[REDACTED]	3	✖ ↑ ↓

1 - 25 of 1379 [Navigation] Show: 25 50 100 All Clear All Filters

Rank	First Name	Last Name	Email	Subject Areas		Relevance	Tpms Rank	Bid	Assigned	Suggested	External Profile	Actions
				Primary	Secondary							
1	Kitty	Wong	[REDACTED]	Clinical applications - Abdomen	Computer Aided Diagnosis, Image Registration, Machine Learning - Domain adaptation, Machine Learning - Interpretability / Explainability, Machine Learning - Uncertainty, Modalities - other Modalities - Video	0.80	1	Not Entered	0	1	GS	
2	Marleen	de Bruijne	[REDACTED]	Clinical applications - Abdomen	Clinical applications - Oncology, Computer Aided Diagnosis, Modalities - CT, Visualisation in Biomedical Imaging	0.80	2	Not Entered	1	1	GS S2 DBLP	
3	MICCAI	2021	[REDACTED]	Clinical applications - Abdomen	Clinical applications - Lung	0.80	3	Not Entered	1	0		
	Mohammad	Hamghalam	[REDACTED]	Image Segmentation	Clinical applications - Abdomen, Clinical applications - Neuroimaging - Brain Development, Modalities - CT, Modalities - MRI	0.16		Not Entered	0	0	GS DBLP	Add
	Aaron	Carass	[REDACTED]	Modalities - MRI		0.00		Not Entered	0	0	GS DBLP	Add

[Back to Meta-Reviewer Console](#)

1 - 25 of 1379 [Navigation]

- When you have completed the selection above, you can return to the main “Meta-reviewer” page by clicking on the “Back to Meta-Reviewer Console” button at the bottom of the page. At this point you will see your list of suggestions in the “Suggestions” column.

Meta-Reviewing 1 - 1 of 1 [Navigation] Show: 25 50 100 All Clear All Filters Actions

Paper ID	Title	Subject Areas		Suggestions	Review				Meta-Reviewer Note	Meta-Review	Review Rating		Actions
		Primary	Secondary		Reviewers	Assigned	Completed	% Completed			Completed	% Completed	
1	my test paper Show Abstract	Clinical applications - Abdomen		1 - Kitty Wong 2 - Marleen de Bruijne 3 - MICCAI 2021	0	0	0%	Add	ID: Meta-Reviewer #3 Enter Meta Review	Status: Awaiting Decision	0	0%	More

7. Repeat this process for each of the papers you have been assigned.
8. We ask you to complete the above steps by *****Wednesday, March 17 23:59 PST*****, so that reviewers can bid for papers on March 19.
9. To report format violation:

If you identified any serious format violation, please indicate in CMT via the Meta-Reviewer Note Column by clicking “add” and list the offense in the comment box.

Meta-Reviewer Note	
Entered?	List Any Serious Format Violation Here
click here... <small>Clear</small>	filter... <small>Clear</small>
Add	

Edit Meta-Reviewer Note

Paper ID 1
Paper Title my test paper

META-REVIEWER NOTE QUESTIONS

1. List any serious format violation here

1000 characters left

Please let us know if anything of the above is not clear to you, and if there is anything we can do to help and assist you in this process.

With best wishes,

MICCAI 2021 Program Chairs