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Review Process Goals

High publication standards – intent of ASME / IGTI to present and publish high quality papers

- Effective communication and interaction between authors, reviewers and session organizers
- Shared responsibility of reviewers and session organizers
- Review chain is the key to paper quality
- Timely actions are important – staying on schedule makes it easier to maintain quality standards and remedy any problems
Resources on the Webtool

Lots of good info here:

- Overview of the Paper Flow Process
- Administrative Roles/Responsibilities
Resources on the Webtool

Organizer Resources

- ASME Plagiarism Screening (iThenticate)
  Information on ASME's plagiarism screening

- ASME Presenter Attendance Policy
  Information on ASME's presenter attendance policy

- Publication Schedule
  A listing of critical publication deadlines to follow in order for technical content to be considered for publication in the conference proceedings

- IGTI Journal and Best Paper Standards
  Information on journal quality and best paper standards for a Turbo Expo paper.

- Turbo Expo Paper Quality Standards
  Information on quality standards for a Turbo Expo paper.

- Review Chair Assignments for TE18 Tracks
  Information on the roles and responsibilities of Turbo Expo organizers.

- Reviewer Conflicts of Interest
  Guidelines for conflicts of interest during the review process.

- Appeal Process for the Journal of Turbomachinery

- Appeal Process for the Journal of Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power

Will add webinar charts (this package)
Review Chain – Decisions

- Session Organizers (possibly in consultation with RCs, PCs, and Vs) make **recommendation** for conference and journal publication based on Reviewer input
- Review Chair makes **final decision** on conference publication
- Review Chair makes **final recommendation** for journal publication to Journal Editor
- Journal Editor makes **final decision** on journal publication
- Journal decisions can be appealed to the editors **after** the conference. Process is posted on the website under Author Resources.
Review Chain – Organizing

- Point Contact organizes all the tracks and abstracts for a committee.
- Vanguard organizes all the sessions and papers for a track.
- Session organizers organize individual sessions.
# Review Chain – Examples

Large committee with multiple tracks

**Heat Transfer Technical Committee**
Chair: Phil Ligrani  
Vice Chair: John Blanton  
Point Contact: Bijay Sultanian

**Track 10: Heat Transfer: Conjugate Heat Transfer**
Vanguard: Tom Shih

**Session 10-1: Conjugate Heat Transfer I**
Session Organizer: GD Lock  
Session Co-organizer: Todd Ebert

Small committee with one track

**Education Technical Committee**
Chair: Sabri Deniz  
Vice Chair: Devin O’Dowd  
Point Contact: Sabri Deniz

**Track 7: Education**
Vanguard: Devin O’Dowd

**Session 7-1: Education Issues**
Session Organizer: Devin O’Dowd  
Session Co-organizer: Sabri Deniz

All roles should be filled: Point Contact, Vanguard, Session Organizer  
(helps the process and communication)

**One person can fill multiple roles**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Track Name</th>
<th>Review Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track 1</td>
<td>Aircraft Engine</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 2</td>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 3</td>
<td>Coal, Biomass &amp; Alternative Fuels</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 4</td>
<td>Combustion, Fuels &amp; Emissions</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 5</td>
<td>Controls, Diagnostics &amp; Instrumentation</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 6</td>
<td>Cycle Innovations</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 7</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 8</td>
<td>Electric Power</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 9</td>
<td>Fans &amp; Blowers</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 10</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Conjugate Heat Transfer</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 11</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Numerical Internal Cooling</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 12</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Numerical Film Cooling</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 13</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: General Experimental Heat Transfer</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 15</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Internal Air Systems &amp; Seals (with Turbomachinery)</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 16</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Experimental Internal Cooling</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 17</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Combustors (with Combustion, Fuels &amp; Emissions)</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 18</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Special Sessions</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 19</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Experimental Film Cooling</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 20</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Multiphysics Modeling &amp; Optimization</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 21</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: Additive Manufacturing</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 22</td>
<td>Heat Transfer: General Computational Heat Transfer</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 23</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Cogeneration</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 24</td>
<td>Manufacturing Materials &amp; Metallurgy</td>
<td>Ardeshir Riahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 25</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>Track Name</td>
<td>Review Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 26</td>
<td>Microturbines, Turbochargers &amp; Small Turbomachines</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 27</td>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Applications</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 28</td>
<td>Organic Rankine Cycle Power Systems</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 29</td>
<td>Steam Turbines</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 30</td>
<td>Structures &amp; Dynamics: Emerging Methods in Design &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 31</td>
<td>Structures &amp; Dynamics: Fatigue, Fracture &amp; Life Prediction</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 32</td>
<td>Structures &amp; Dynamics: Probabilistic Methods</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 33</td>
<td>Structures &amp; Dynamics: Rotordynamics</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 34</td>
<td>Structures &amp; Dynamics: Bearing &amp; Seal Dynamics</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 35</td>
<td>Structures &amp; Dynamics: Structural Mechanics, Vibration &amp; Damping</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 36</td>
<td>Structures &amp; Dynamics: Aerodynamic Excitation &amp; Damping</td>
<td>Wing Ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 37</td>
<td>Supercritical CO2 Power Cycles</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 38</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Axial Flow Fan &amp; Compressor Aerodynamics</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 39</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Axial Flow Turbine Aerodynamics</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 40</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Design Methods &amp; CFD Modeling for Turbomachinery</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 41</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Ducts &amp; Component Interactions</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 42</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Noise &amp; Innovative Noise Reduction (with Aircraft Engin)</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 43</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Radial Turbomachinery Aerodynamics</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 44</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Unsteady Flows in Turbomachinery</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 45</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Multidisciplinary Design Approaches, Optimization &amp; U</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 46</td>
<td>Turbomachinery: Deposition, Erosion, Fouling, and Icing</td>
<td>Graham Pullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track 47</td>
<td>Wind Energy</td>
<td>Dilip Prasad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule
Process has many steps that must be done in series

If you are late or incomplete to a deadline, it puts untenable pressure on the downstream steps

Deadlines are completion dates, not start dates

Start early!

TCC, V/PC, SO all need to check, monitor, support, and push along progress and quality throughout their span of responsibility

• Send reminders to start tasks and meet deadlines
• Check status and address problems regularly

RCs cannot manage 1500 papers and 4500 reviewers without your help!
## TE19 Publication Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE18 concludes</td>
<td>June 15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Abstract for Review</td>
<td>August 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Acceptance Notification</td>
<td>September 18, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions with SOs set in tool</td>
<td>September 25, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Draft Paper for Review</td>
<td>November 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All reviewers assigned in tool</td>
<td>November 6, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Paper Reviews Complete</td>
<td>November 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of Paper Acceptance/Revision Requirements</td>
<td>December 17, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Revised Paper for Review</td>
<td>January 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Notification of Acceptance of Revised Paper</td>
<td>Feb 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Final Paper</td>
<td>February 21, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Paper Approval by Review Chair</td>
<td>March 13, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V/PC**
- 3 weeks

**SO**
- 4 weeks
- 5 weeks / 1 week
- 3 weeks

**Reviewer**
- 3 weeks
- Still very tight
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### Revision Cycle Notes
- Revision cycle is still very tight, stay on top of things, use revisions judiciously.

### Timeline
- 3 weeks
- 4 weeks
- 3 weeks
- Still very tight
Tasks for each role
Technical Committee Chair Tasks

Post review process:
- Line up tutorials
- Consolidate sessions as required for schedule
- Make recommendations to ASME for scheduling
- Check on-line schedule, printed program for errors

Conference week:
- Attend CoC Sunday 6:00
- Put together charts for Committee meeting, run meeting

General:
- Maintain membership list
- Support best paper judging process
- Coordinate with student liaison
- Support student reviewer process
- support various requests for award nominations and judging
- Intervene with ASME to get support - web tool, late uploads, etc.
Technical Committee Chair Tasks

Review process:

• Line up Point Contact
• With Point Contact, define tracks within the technical committee – scope and description
• Regularly check tracks and sessions for progress to key deadlines and adherence to quality requirements
  – SOs assigned by September 25
  – All reviewers assigned by November 6
  – Requirements for reviewers are all met, see page 16
  – All reviews completed by November 28
  – Recommendations complete by December 17 (February 5 for revisions)
• Support and advise others as needed throughout the review process
Point Contact Tasks

Review process:

• With Committee Chair, define tracks within the technical committee – scope and description
• Line up vanguard chairs
• Regularly check tracks and sessions for progress to key deadlines and adherence to quality requirements
  – SOs assigned by September 25
  – All reviewers assigned by November 6
  – Requirements for reviewers are all met, see page 16
  – All reviews completed by November 28
  – Recommendations complete by December 17 (February 5 for revisions)
• Support and advise others as needed throughout the review process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start, deadline</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30 - August 28</td>
<td>Define track scope and description Line up SOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28 - September 18</td>
<td>Move abstracts to other tracks if appropriate (1st week) Accept or reject abstracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18-September 25</td>
<td>Form sessions, assign abstracts, assign SOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25-October 30</td>
<td>Provide teleconference training for all SOs Push SOs to line up reviewers <strong>now</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30 - November 6</td>
<td>Move papers to rebalance sessions if necessary Make sure SOs have all reviewers assigned appropriately and on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6 - November 28</td>
<td>Support SOs in enforcing review quality; return poor reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28 - December 17</td>
<td>Support SOs in getting late reviews completed Push SOs to complete their recommendations with solid comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17 - Feb 5</td>
<td>Continue to monitor and push completion of late reviews and recommendations, especially for revised papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>Follow up on any unsubmitted final papers – right away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March - May</td>
<td>Consolidate sessions as required, update session names and descriptions Check online and printed programs for errors Confirm attendance of SOs as chairs, identify subs as needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Session Organizer Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start, deadline</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now – September 25</td>
<td><strong>Line up co-organizer to help with reviews. Diversity will help find reviewers. Line up reviewers for your session.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| October 30 - November 6 | **Check iThenticate scores; reject if very high, discussing with TCC and RC Assign all reviewers by Nov 6**  
Meet requirements for reviewers; avoid all conflicts of interest                                                                 |
| November 6 - November 28 | **Check reviews as they come in; if inadequate, have TCC or RC return the review and request improvements in the comment box.**                                                                                 |
| November 28 - December 17 | **Follow up late reviews to get them completed ASAP**  
Make your recommendations for conference and for journal  
For scores <100, follow process to consider rejection; engage RCs                                                                                       |
| December 17 - January 15 | **Energetically work to close any late items**                                                                                                                                                         |
| January 15 - February 5 | **Process all revised drafts – send for re-review or do the re-review yourself**  
Engage RCs to consider rejects                                                                                                                                                                          |
| February 21          | **Follow up on any unsubmitted final papers – right away**                                                                                                                                              |
| March - June         | **Update session info in tool – chair, co-chair, paper order, session name**  
Check online schedule, printed program, for errors  
Confirm authors’ attendance and bio information**                                                                                                             |
At the conference

Session Organizer and Co-Organizer organize the reviews
Session Chair and Co-Chair run the sessions at the conference

ideally the same but this doesn’t always work
chairs will be entered into the system in March

Attend the authors breakfast, meet authors, confirm bio information, answer questions.

See instructions in your session folder you pick up at the breakfast.

Moderate the session.

Remind attendees: no photos allowed. Enforce this during the session.

Q&A: ask people to stand, introduce themselves, speak clearly

Provide feedback form to ASME: attendance, best papers, no-shows, etc.
Review Chair Team Tasks

Make final conference acceptance for every paper – March
  make sure the review process meets standards
Make recommendation for journal – March
  must be substantiated

During the review process:
  Consult on low-score papers to consider rejections
  Consult on iThenticate scores
  Consult on any part of the review process – don’t hesitate!

  Track progress and integrity of the review process
Authorship conflicts

A Committee Chair, Vanguard, or Point Contact who is an author of a paper is not allowed to take any action on that paper.

- The Review Chair can be engaged to review and accept abstracts, and to provide consultation with the Session Organizer if needed.

A Session Organizer who is an author of a paper is not allowed to take any action on that paper.

- That paper should be moved to a different session. If this is impossible, a Co-chair with no conflicts of interest can be enlisted to coordinate those reviews, including making recommendations.
Conflicts of Interest

Review chain conflicts

No organizer should serve as a reviewer for a paper in their area of responsibility. This includes Review Chairs and Vice Chairs, Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs, Vanguards, Point Contacts, and Session Organizers.

For example a Vanguard Chair may not do a review for a session in his/her track, and a Session Organizer may not review a paper in his/her session.
Organizational conflicts

A Session Organizer should not handle the reviews for a paper whose author is from the same organization.

- A Co-chair with no conflicts of interest can be enlisted to coordinate those reviews, including making recommendations.

A Committee Chair or Co-Chair, Vanguard, or Point Contact should not be involved in a review of a paper whose author is from the same organization.

- If the SO would like some consultation, the Review Chair team can be engaged.

No reviewer for a paper can be from the same organization as any of the authors.
Reviewer Requirements

- Line up reviewers early; assign in tool by **November 6**
  - Select three reviewers – preferably industry, government and academia, but **at least two** of these three sectors are required
  - No two reviewers of a paper can be from the same organization
  - No reviewer can be from the same organization as authors
  - If needed, ask your Vanguard Chair or Point Contact for help in reviewer selection
  - These requirements are non-negotiable and will be checked centrally. Misses must be fixed, and this causes a huge amount of delay and rework. Do it right the first time!

- Need V/PC and TCC to check and enforce this.
Lining up Reviewers

• Suggest lining up reviewers as soon as you know your session, even though they cannot be assigned in the tool until the drafts are in.

• Consider authors from previous years, other SOs; get a co-organizer from a different sector to help find diverse reviewers; trade contacts with other SOs

• Use direct contact such as email or phone to get commitment. Don’t rely on just assigning someone in the tool.

• You do not need more than three reviewers.

• Ask that the reviewer Accept or Decline in the tool. Reviewers must now Accept in order to access the paper and do the review.

• If a reviewer declines, remove that reviewer from the tool and find a new one.
Reviewer Tasks

• We know the review process is demanding. Detailed inputs are necessary for meeting ASME standards for the conference and the journal. Thank you for your efforts!

• Please Accept or Decline the invitation by clicking on the link in the invitation email you receive.
  – Starting this year, you must Accept in order to access the draft and perform the review.
  – If you can’t Accept, please Decline. This lets the session organizer know that someone else should be found to do the review.

• Keep your session organizer informed on your status, particularly if you have questions or are running late.
Reviewer Tasks

• You **must substantiate** your recommendation for / against conference presentation.

• IGTI review process is also a **journal review process** – you **must also substantiate** your recommendation for / against journal publication.

• For poor quality papers, seriously consider whether Reject would be the appropriate recommendation for the good of the conference.

• Consider and comment on the iThenticate results as well as the paper itself.

• Please provide your **completed review** by **November 28, 2018**.
Reviewer Anonymity

• Please keep the identity of reviewers confidential
  – From authors and from the other reviewers on the paper
  – From the community at large

• Best practices
  – Use caution with emails looking for reviewers, agreeing to be a reviewers, or communicating with reviewers
  – Use blind copy (bcc)
  – Avoid Reply to All
  – Reviewers: make sure your review comments do not identify you. Check that your .pdf files do not identify you or your organization.
Prior to assigning reviewers, organizers will need to analyze any matching results over 15%.

Two areas of concern: plagiarism (copying someone else’s work), and lack of originality (copying your own previous published work).

When assessing a paper, consider:
  – Is there any source with high degrees of match (>15%), or are there just lots of 2% - 3% matches of phrases?
  – If there is a source with a high match, has that source been properly referenced in the paper?
  – Are the matches limited to the introduction, description of the analysis, experimental setup, etc., or are there high matches in the results and conclusions portions of the paper?
If you have concerns, discussing with Vanguards and TTCs and RCs. For feedback from ASME, email toolboxhelp@asme.org

Outcomes can be:

- Reject the paper outright.
- Caution the author about the concerns and request changes. These changes can include properly referencing papers with matches, and/or to reword sections to reduce the degree of outright copying. SO should check the final paper to make sure these directions have been followed, and alert the review chair if there are still concerns. Proceed with reviews; reviewers should also comment on matches.
- Let the paper go through with reviews with no special action.
Reviewer Tasks

• We know the review process is demanding. Detailed inputs are necessary for meeting ASME standards for the conference and the journal. Thank you for your efforts!

• You **must substantiate** your recommendation for / against conference presentation.

• IGTI review process is also a **journal review process** – you **must also substantiate** your recommendation for / against journal publication.

• For poor quality papers, seriously consider whether Reject would be the appropriate recommendation for the good of the conference.

• Consider and comment on the iThenticate results as well as the paper itself.

• Please provide your **completed review** by **November 28, 2018**.
• A summary of important points of paper in at least three to four sentences to indicate that Reviewer actually understands paper
• Statement of significance, relevance and originality of the research, or lack thereof
• A critical evaluation of methodology, accuracy and suitability of the work
• An evaluation of quality of the manuscript
• Clear statements of necessary changes required before presentation / publication
• Recommendation for or against conference presentation
• Recommendation for or against journal publication
• If required elements are missing, the review may be reopened and returned to you for completion.
Added back the radio buttons from previous years. These ratings will be used to calculate the screening score.

Lower word requirement. Please exceed!
2. Add back the radio buttons from previous years.

Some boxes do not have word requirements.

This box is not needed if the paper is fine as is.

Use this box if the paper is close to journal quality, whether or not you recommended it for journal.

Please be clear and specific here, to help the SO and RC

Please be clear and specific here, to help the SO and RC
Webtool Reviewer Page (cont.)

Links to reference documents.

New option, not required

Reworded for clarity; formerly “Acceptable with major revisions”
Paper quality initiative –

Process for poor papers
Paper Quality Improvement Initiative

• Will continue with the paper quality processes used in T#2018 Oslo
• Use reviewer template to require comments, plus rating buttons
• Calculate paper score from reviewer ratings, use as a guideline for further action
• Review Chairs to engage early in the process to make decisions on papers with low scores or high iThenticate scores
• Encourage rejections of initial drafts where appropriate – where a revision is unlikely to result in a good quality paper

SO comments from TE18: “I asked for a revision, wanting to give the author the benefit of the doubt, but I should have just rejected the initial draft, it would have been better for everyone in the long run.”
Score Calculation

- SCORE per reviewer = 2*Originality + 2*Scientific Relevance + 2*Engineering Relevance + 1.5*Completeness + 1.5*Acknowledgment + 1.2*Organization + 1.2*Clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Numerical Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Overall paper score = sum of three reviewer scores

- Total maximum paper score = 171

- Paper score if all reviews acceptable = 102.6
Review Process Steps

Reviewer provides recommendations, radio buttons, and comments in template.
• Ideally this will all be consistent, realistically it frequently will not be.

SO considers all reviewer inputs as well as the calculated score

SO can override recommendations and reject a paper if all these are true:
1. Score is below 100 – paper falls below Acceptable standards
2. 2 reviewers recommend Major Revisions or Reject
3. Comments from 2 reviewers support this low score, i.e. point out significant shortcomings that are unlikely to be fixed in a revision
4. SO discusses the paper with RC / VRC and they both agree to reject
   • SO should initiate this discussion if 1, 2, and 3 are all true
   • Committee chair and vanguard are copied on communication, can offer input if desired

Gives SO more leeway, and more responsibility, to interpret the reviewers’ input.
   Involves RC earlier in the decision process.
Decision trees for recommendations
SO Recommendations

The SO is not a reviewer.

SO job is to coordinate and interpret the input of the reviewers, not to override it.

Use the following decision tree to make your recommendations.

Read the comments of the reviewers; check that their comments support the buttons they click.
2 reviewers say Accept or Accept with Minor Revision, 2 Journal, and their comments support these recommendations:

- Recommend Accept and check Journal box

2 reviewers say Accept or Accept with Minor Revisions, 1 Journal and 1 supportive Journal comments

- Request revision to try for Journal; explain clearly in the comments

2 reviewers say Require Revision

- Request revision; explain clearly in the comments
2 reviewers say Reject
  • Reject

2 reviewers say Require Revision or Reject
  • Study comments – is paper likely to be modified to meet requirements?
  • If no, consult with Review Chair and agree on a path
  • Strongly consider Reject; otherwise Request Revised Draft
What to do when you get wildly disparate reviews?

Score probably doesn’t mean much in this case

Carefully read each review. Consider the relative expertise of your three reviewers, as well as the sector they represent relative to the authors.

Consult with Vanguard and Review Chair and agree on a path.

Best path is to go with the majority opinion of the reviewers.

Make sure you explain your rationale in the comment boxes in the tool.
Note reviewer scores and total (sum) score. If total score < 100, follow new process to consider a rejection.

Only review chairs can re-open a review. Request this if a review needs improvement.
New option, if you want to be more candid with the review chairs

Please be specific; see examples in this package.

Use sparingly:
- Paper than can realistically come up to good quality within the short revision window
- Paper that may realistically come up to journal quality

Link to reference info
Supporting detail for recommendations, with example SO comments
Recommend to Accept

In the comments:

• Give a summary of your rationale for your recommendation for conference
• Give a summary of your rationale for or against journal
• Explain that the final decision will be made by the review chair
• Remind the authors that they still need to submit their final paper, by the deadline of February 21, preferably earlier
Example SO comments

Based on the reviews received I am pleased to inform you that I am recommending to the Review chair to accept your paper for publication at the conference. The reviewers made some helpful suggestions to improve the paper which I ask you to consider when preparing the final manuscript. Note you must still upload your final paper no later than February 21.

   - plus one of these -

I am recommending the paper for journal publication based on the recommendations of the reviewers. The findings have not been published before and shed new light on an important problem in the field. The ideas presented are innovative and promise new technological developments with impact in the field.

I am recommending the paper for journal based on one reviewer recommendation as well as an email exchange with reviewer #2 to clarify his views, which supported a journal recommendation. The findings . . . .

I am not recommending the paper for journal based on the recommendations of the reviewers. The approach has limited applicability and the paper lacked guidelines that could advance the field and be useful to the design community.
Revision for Borderline Journal

• If one reviewer says Journal and another indicates the paper is close to journal, you may offer a revision to improve chances of a Journal recommendation.

• Make this very clear to the authors and to the re-reviewers.

• When the revision comes in:
  – Ask for a re-review from a reviewer who indicated possibility of Journal, and ask that he be clear about his assessment of the revised paper for journal.
  – Do not ask for a re-review from a reviewer who already recommended Journal, or a reviewer who gave a very negative review. This is a waste of time.

• If the paper now has two reviewers recommending journal, make sure you check the Journal box and explain in your comments
Example SO comments

Your paper received one Journal recommendation and other comments that indicate that a Journal recommendation is within reach. Therefore I am requesting a revised draft, which I then will reconsider for Journal. The reviewer comments offer good suggestions and guidance on what would be required for Journal.

If you would like to pursue a Journal recommendation at this point, submit a revised draft, highlighting your changes, and also submit a rebuttal that responds to reviewer comments. This needs to be done no later than January 15.

If you do not want to take this step, simply resubmit your original draft. It will be recommended to be accepted for conference based on the initial reviewer recommendations, but it will not recommended for Journal. In either case, you will still need to also upload a final paper before the deadline of February 21.
Requiring a Revision

- Request Revision if:
  - 2 reviewers say Revision  -and-
  - There is an excellent chance the authors will make all the required changes for the paper to be acceptable  -and-
  - Score > 100  -or-  Review Chair concurs to ask for revision

- Do this as soon as possible, don’t wait for the deadline

- In the comment box:
  - Summarize your recommendation with reasons
  - Request authors to upload revised draft by January 15
  - Have authors highlight changes and provide a rebuttal in response to reviewer comments
Example SO comments

I am recommending that this paper not be accepted in its current form, but I will consider a major revision. This is consistent with the recommendations of the reviewers, who note that this result contradicts other published findings and this issue is not addressed at all in the paper. The current findings must be explained in context of previous work for the paper to be accepted.

You may submit a revised paper for reconsideration before January 15. Please highlight the changes and include a rebuttal that responds to the reviewer comments, especially those deemed necessary for acceptance.
Reviewing the Revised Draft

• If you choose to send revised draft out for re-review:
  – Do this immediately; request re-review in the tool by January 22.
  – Do not ask for a re-review from a reviewer who said Accept. This is a waste of time.

• If you choose to assess the paper yourself:
  – Assess versus the criteria laid out as necessary for acceptance in the comments
  – Consider re-reviews together with original positive reviews

• Make your recommendation on revised draft by February 5
  – Engage the Review Chair if decision is still unclear.
  – In comments, clearly explain your reasoning.
  – No second revisions – you must Accept or Reject the revision.
Reject (1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} draft)

- In the comment box, give a summary of reviewer comments substantiating your recommendation and the reasons for rejection.

- If there was only one reject recommendation, you should have consulted with the review chair. You can note in the comments that the RC concurs with the decision.
Example SO comments

After extensive consideration of the reviews received, including comments, ratings, and recommendations, I am sorry to say that your paper is not recommended for conference publication because it does not meet ASME and IGTI standards. The reviewers noted several major technical flaws in your approach and arguments, which may have led you to conclusions which are inconsistent with other, previous work.

The Review Chair concurs with this decision. We encourage you to carefully consider the input from the reviewers, and we would welcome the submission of an improved paper for one of the upcoming ASME Turbo Expo events.
Key ingredients of an effective and efficient review process are:

- **Communication and interaction** between authors, reviewers and session organizers
- Vanguards and committee chairs do quality control
- **Shared responsibility** of reviewers and session organizers

New elements for 2018 are:

- More active engagement of **Review Chairs** earlier in the process
- Emphasis on **raising** minimum quality
New webtool area: Help > Organizer Resources

- This training package
- Paper quality standards
- Journal quality standards
- Conflict of interest details (also in this package)
- Review chair assignments to committees (also in this package)
- Recording of training webinar

Vanguards: use this material for discussion with your SOs
encourage telecons