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• Roles of Session Organizer (SO)
  (~30 min)  by Harald Schoenenborn

• Training of the new webtool
  (~20 min)  by Stacey Cooper

• Q&A
  (~10 min)

*Stacey (CooperSL@asme.org) is our Web master and is most helpful in answering questions on the new webtool.
• This session is primarily for SO only.

• There will be future separate training sessions for reviewers for both their roles/responsibilities and the use of the new webtool.
Review Chain – Decisions

- Session Organizers (possibly in consultation with RCs, PCs, and VCs) 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.
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

* Info on Paper Quality Initiative is available in backup slides, pp. 25-28
Tasks for SOs

- Responsibility
- iThenticate check
- Conflicts of interest (COI)
- Organizing the review process
You are the most important link for the entire review process!

For the majority of cases, your decision will be the final decision for the paper*

* Info on supporting details for recommendations is available in backup slides, pp. 33-39
The SO is not a reviewer.

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

* More info on decision tree is available in backup slides pp. 29-32
iThenticate Check

- As soon as a paper is uploaded, check iThenticate score
- Anything > 15%, ask authors for an explanation*

* More details are provided in backup slides pp. 21 - 22
Authorship conflicts

A Committee Chair or Track Organizer 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.

* More info on COI is available in backup slides, pp. 22-23
Reviewer Requirements

• Line up reviewers **early**; assign in tool; well before draft paper is submitted (Dec 4, 2019)
  – 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 Track Organizer 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 Track Organizer and Tech Committee chair 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.

- The reviewer no longer has to accept the review in the tool. A declining reviewer will be automatically removed as a reviewer in the tool, the SO doesn’t have to remove them, and a notification email will sent to the SO to flag that a new reviewer must be selected.

- New reviewers can be created in the database.
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.
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
Meet authors, confirm bio information, answer questions.
See instructions in your session folder you pick up.
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.
Schedule
You must have all your papers reviewed by

Jan 3 (Fri), 2020

Paper submissions deadline is Dec 4, 2019

This gives you less than a month!

(Again, you should have your reviewers lined-up soon.)
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!

TO/VC/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!
# Session Organizer Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start, deadline</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 6 – November 30</td>
<td>Line up co-organizer to help with reviews. Diversity will help find reviewers. Line up reviewers for your session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4 - December 11</td>
<td>Check iThenticate scores; reject if very high, discussing with TCC and RC <strong>Assign all reviewers by Dec 9</strong> Meet requirements for reviewers; avoid all conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11 - January 3</td>
<td>Check reviews as they come in; if inadequate, have TCC or RC return the review and request improvements in the comment box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 3– January 10</td>
<td>Follow up late reviews to get them completed ASAP Make your recommendations for conference and for journal For scores &lt;100, follow process to consider rejection; engage RCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10 - January 31</td>
<td>Energetically work to close any late items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31 - February 18</td>
<td>Process all revised drafts – send for re-review or do the re-review yourself Engage RCs to consider rejects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>Submission of final paper. Follow up on any unsubmitted final papers – right away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March - June</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• iThenticate check (pp. 21-22)
• COI (pp. 23-24)
• Paper quality initiative (pp. 25-28)
• Decision tree for recommendation (pp. 29-32)
• Supporting details for recommendation (pp. 33-39)
• Responsible review chairs (RC) for tracks (p. 40)
iThenticate Guidelines for Flagged Papers Above 15% Match

• 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.
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, Track Organizers, and Session Organizers.

For example a Track Organizer 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, Co-Chair, or Track Organizer 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.
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
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
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
Decision Tree, Score < 100

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

*) Responsible Review Chairs for Tracks see p. 40
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.
Supporting details for recommendations, with example SO comments
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 March 17, 2020, 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 March 17, 2020.

- 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.
• 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 31, 2020.

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 March 17, 2020.
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 31, 2020
  - 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 31, 2020. Please highlight the changes and include a rebuttal that responds to the reviewer comments, especially those deemed necessary for acceptance.
Review Chairs

Responsible review chairs for tracks (Track-No.)

Ardeshir Riahi
- Heat transfer (9-14) /Ind & Cogen (15) /Manu (16) /Ceramics (2)

Harald Schoenenborn
- Struct & Dyn (20-27) /Aircraft Eng (1)

Keun Ryu
- Turbomachinery (30-39,41,46) /Combustion (3) /Microturb, turbocharge & small turbo (18)

Wing Ng
- Wind energy (40) /Supercrit CO2 (29) /Oil & gas (19) /Organic Rankine (42) /Education (6) /Cycle Inno (5, 44) /Controls (4) /Coal & Biomass (43) /Steam Turb (45) /Electric Power (7) /Fan & Blowers (8) /Marine (17)
Training of the new webtool
by Stacey Cooper
Overview of webtool organization - SO

My submissions
- Authors

My reviewing assignments
- TO – accept/reject abstracts
- Reviewer – review draft papers
- Review chair – final decision

Reviewer Team Manager
- Review chairs and conference organizers – see all sessions, organizers, abstracts/papers, status

My sessions
- TO – go into session, pull abstracts into sessions
- TO – assign session organizer, change title, description
- SO – add co-chair, change title, description
- SO or TO – reorder papers, remove papers, add to other sessions

Organizer tools
- All organizers – shows big list of all abstracts and papers
- All organizers – can export excel file showing all papers
- SO – assign reviewers, view reviews, make “decision”
Go to **My Sessions** on the main menu.

You should see a list of all sessions for which you are SO.

To work with a session, click on Edit Details.

**Details** tab will let you add a description. Retain the session number in the title, there is no separate session number.

**Session Chairs** tab will let you name co-organizers.

**Agenda** tab will show all the papers assigned to your session. You eventually can change the order of presentation etc. here.
SO – How to see details of all your papers

Go to Organizer Tools, from the main menu.

Click on List Abstracts

Shows papers in your session(s) all in one list.

Organizer functions:

Hit Export Scores to download an excel file. (Later this will contain more info but for now it will have the papers with their session numbers.)

Use little arrows to sort different ways
Go to **Organizer Tools**, from the main menu, click on List Abstracts (previous page).

To **see the paper**, click on View, then click “Draft Paper Submission” for the .pdf, “Authors” to see who the authors are – check to avoid conflicts with reviewers

Go back to previous page (back button doesn’t work, go to the previous window in your browser)

To **assign reviewers**, click on Manage, make sure you are on the Reviewers tab, then Add Reviewer, then Assign.

The reviewer does not have to Accept the review in this system. Reviewers may Recuse themselves; you will not be notified via email, they will just disappear from the tool. Keep checking the tool to make sure you have three reviewers.

The system will allow you to assign more than three reviewers but please don’t do this.

If you don’t see your desired reviewer in the list, send them an email and ask them to “opt in” by clicking this link:
https://asme-turboexpo.secure-platform.com:443/a/judgeSolicitationProfiles/create?solicitationId=4
After they complete the process, you should see their name in the list.
SO – How to see review results

Go to Organizer Tools, from the main menu, click on List Abstracts.

Shows papers in your session(s).

**Organizer functions:**

Hit Export Scores to download an excel file. This will include results from all the reviews.

This shows reviews completed and reviews assigned

Click here to see the review results for each reviewer for that paper.
“Average Score” is the average of all the reviewer scores.

“Score Overall Sum” is the sum of all the reviewer scores.

“Reviewer Total Score” is the score for that individual reviewer.

“finalRecommendation” and “isThisJournalQuality” are recommendations of that individual reviewer.

“Final Chair Decision” is the SO “decision”, not the review chair decision.

iThenticate overall score and details are also available.
SO – How to make your recommendation

This is called “Decision” in the tool, but note for Turbo Expo the SO does not make the final decision.

Go to Organizer Tools, from the main menu, click on List Abstracts.

Organizer functions:

Click Manage, then click on Decision tab.

You can make a decision once you have three reviews complete.

Make your recommendation for conference and for journal.

Make sure your comments support your journal recommendation.

If you Reject a paper, please email your Review Chair FYI.

You cannot see the review results from the Decision tab. To see reviews, return to the abstract list and click on View Comments.
Reviewer process (for reference)

There is no way for the reviewer to create, review, and store a readable summary .pdf.

There is no Submit button, only Save (scroll to the very bottom of inputs). Review is available to SO as soon as it is Saved.

Review can be changed until the SO makes a recommendation decision. So if the SO needs more info from the reviewer, the reviewer can add it in the system without further intervention.
Questions / Help

For any problems, email toolboxhelp@asme.org or CooperSL@asme.org.

For author problems, encourage the author to email toolboxhelp@asme.org, with organizers on copy.

This will go to Stacey Cooper and her team.