REVIEWING GUIDELINES (adapted from MICCAI 2016)

IPCAI publications appear within the IJCARS journal. For this reason, the IPCAI review process is followed by a IJCARS revision process. That means the IPCAI papers should be reviewed like IJCARS papers, with the same quality standards. Information about the review process in general can be found on http://ipcai.org/.

As reviewer, you have to decide similar to a journal about "accept as is/accept with minor revision/major revision/reject". Depending on your suggestion, the authors upload a revised version and a response to the reviewers to IJCARS.

A good review expresses an opinion about the paper and backs it up with details on strengths and weaknesses of the paper. It is not sufficient to simply summarize the paper and add a couple of questions about low-level details in the paper. Nor it is acceptable to express an opinion without backing it up with specifics.

A good review is polite. Just like in a conversation, being rude is typically ineffective if one wants to be heard.

While the format might vary, a good review typically includes the following components:

- A quick summary of the paper, which can be as short as a couple of sentences. This part tells the committee what the major contributions are, what the authors did, how they did it, and what were the results. This part is also helpful for the authors to verify that the reviewer understood their approach and interpretation of the results.
- The opinion of the reviewer about the paper overall. Is it an interesting contribution? Should this paper be presented at the conference? Should it be known to a larger group of people? Is it a significant advance for the field?
- Important: Please remember there a different contribution categories, a novel algorithm is only one of many ways to contribute meaningfully. A novel interventional system or system integration, a validation or clinical study with insightful results, an application of existing analysis methods to a novel problem with interesting results are just a few more examples.
- The opinion of the reviewer about the clarity of presentation, paper organization and other stylistic aspects of the paper. It is important to know whether the paper is very clear and a pleasure to read, or whether it is hard to understand.
- The opinion of the reviewer about the major strengths of the paper. However tempting it is to immediately point out the problems, a reviewer should also write about a novel formulation, an profound evaluation, an original way to use data, a novel application, or anything else that is a strong aspect of this work.
- The major criticisms that a reviewer has about the paper. An effective way to deliver this critique is to summarize it briefly (at most two-three sentences), and then provide detailed arguments so that the committee and the authors can understand the reviewer's concerns about particular aspects of the paper.
- A list of minor problems, such as grammatical errors, typos, and other problems that can be easily fixed by carefully editing the text of the paper.
- If the reviewer's expertise is limited to a particular aspect of the paper, a confidential note to the program committee that describes his/her relevant expertise. The review is more likely to be taken seriously if the limitations of the reviewer's understanding are clearly acknowledged.

Confidentiality

As a reviewer for IPCAI, you have the responsibility to protect the confidentiality of the ideas represented in the papers you review. IPCAI submissions are by their very nature not published documents. The work is considered new or proprietary by the authors; otherwise they would not have submitted it. Therefore, it is required that you strictly follow the following recommendations:

- Do not show the paper to anyone else, including colleagues or students, unless you have asked them to write a review, or to help with your review.
- Do not show any results or videos/images or any of the supplementary material to non-reviewers.
- Do not use ideas from a paper you review to develop new ones of your own before its publication.
- After the review process, destroy all copies of papers and supplementary material associated with the submission.

Conflict of Interest

Primary Area Chairs will try hard to avoid conflicts of interest. But if you have <a conflict of interest, notify the primary. 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 five years,
- you hold or have applied for a grant together,
- you currently collaborate or plan to collaborate,
- you have a business partnership,
- you are relatives have a close personal relationship.

Reviewer Anonymity

A reviewer's identity should not be revealed to the authors at any point in time, both during and after the submission phase. Requesting citations primarily to one's own work may break anonymity so it should be considered carefully.