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Contents

• Roles of Reviewers by Review Chair Team (~30 min)
• Training of the webtool by Stacey Cooper (~20 min)
• Q&A (~10 min)
• This session is primarily for Reviewers only.

• Identity of reviewers will be kept confidential from the authors and the other reviewers on the paper.
The review process is evaluating two publication paths: Conference & Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>SO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Recommendation</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>JE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
Reviewer Tasks

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

• You no longer have to accept the review in the tool.

• However, if you don’t want to 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 **February 09, 2024**.

• Be available for re-review if paper quality can be improved.
Reviewer Tasks

- Consult guidelines in author resources
Reviewer Anonymity

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

• Best practices
  – Use caution with emails in the correspondence with SO
  – Use blind copy (bcc)
  – Avoid Reply to All
  – make sure your review comments do not identify you
  – Check that your .pdf files do not identify you or your organization.
• 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. => so do it right the first time!
# Schedule

## Important Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct 27</th>
<th>March 01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2023</td>
<td>March 01, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract Submission</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submission of Revised Paper for Review (if required)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov 24</th>
<th>Mar 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 24, 2023</td>
<td>March 18, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification of Abstract Acceptance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Author Notification of Acceptance of Revised Papers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan 05</th>
<th>Apr 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 05, 2024</td>
<td>April 15, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission of Full-Length Paper for Review</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submission of Copyright Form</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feb 09</th>
<th>Apr 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 09, 2024</td>
<td>April 18, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Review Complete</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final Paper Submission</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feb 16</th>
<th>May 02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2024</td>
<td>May 02, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Acceptance Notification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final Paper Decision Notification</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes on 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!

• Keep your Session Organizer informed of possible delays.

• RCs cannot manage 1500 papers and 4500 reviewers without your help!
# TE24 Publication Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission of Abstract</th>
<th>Oct 27, 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author Notification of Abstract Acceptance:</td>
<td>Nov 24, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions Drafted and Session Organizers Assigned to Sessions:</td>
<td>Dec 01, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Full-Length Paper for Review:</td>
<td>Jan 05, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Reviews Completed:</strong></td>
<td>Feb 09, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Notification of Full-Length Paper Acceptance:</td>
<td>Feb 16, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Revised Paper for Review (if required):</td>
<td>Mar 01, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Notification of Acceptance of Revised Paper:</td>
<td>Mar 18, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Final Paper:</td>
<td>Apr 18, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Paper Approval by Review Chair:</td>
<td>May 02, 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKUP
Paper quality initiative –

Process to improve the review process
• Will continue with the paper quality processes used in TE2018 Oslo
• Use reviewer template to require comments, plus rating buttons incorporated into the new webtool
• Use paper score from reviewer ratings 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
• Are several radio buttons that are meant to check for specific things where most responses are expected to be one way, but if not, reviewer should provide explanation elsewhere – i.e. if issue with an equation, or there is evidence of commercialism, etc.
Score Calculation

Per reviewer:

\[ \text{Score} = 2 \cdot \text{Originality} + 2 \cdot \text{ScientificRelevance} + 2 \cdot \text{EngineeringRelevance} + 1.5 \cdot \text{Completeness} + 1.5 \cdot \text{Acknowledgment} + 1.2 \cdot \text{Organization} + 1.2 \cdot \text{clarity} \]

<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>

For definitions of Originality, ..., see https://asme-turboexpo.secure-platform.com/a/page/author_resources/paper_quality

- 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.
## Responsible review chairs for tracks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Chair</th>
<th>Tracks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shahrokh Shalpar</td>
<td>Aircraft Engines, Coal, Fans, Steam Turbine, Structures &amp; Dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Dudebout</td>
<td>Comb, Cycle(ORC &amp; ES), Oil &amp; Gas, Supercritical CO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Nix</td>
<td>Turbomachinery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to assigning reviewers, organizers will need to analyze any matching results over 25%.

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 (>25%), or are there just lots of <1% matches of phrases?
- 50x <1% = no problem
- 1x 50% = problem
- 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, discuss it with TO/VC/PC and RC. 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 Training of the webtool
by Stacey Cooper
Draft Paper Review

Click on “My Reviewing Assignments” to begin the draft paper review process.
Click on the “Open” to start the paper review process.
• Reviewers can filter by paper type for the review.
• Click on “Open” to start the draft paper review process.
Like the abstract review you will see a list of papers that have been reviewed and those that are awaiting review.

The same search and filter capabilities and file downloads are available.

Click on the paper title or “View Submission” to start the review.
Reviewers can see the iThenticate score and match link, download the PDF file, and easily view the paper on your desktop.

The system will automatically save your comments so that you can leave and come back at any time.

Click on “Save and Back to List” to submit the review.
Additional Help Resources

- Contact ASME at https://airtable.com/appKe8wyTv3RoG8qS/shrc4rgubaoKlbmFB
- Help Center Calls Every Tuesday and Thursday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesdays @ 10:00 am EST</th>
<th>Thursdays @ 2:00 pm EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting number: 649 158 530 <a href="https://asme.webex.com/asme/j.php?MTID=m037c3e15004fee0e36ce2571d6543910">https://asme.webex.com/asme/j.php?MTID=m037c3e15004fee0e36ce2571d6543910</a></td>
<td>Meeting number: 640 607 424 <a href="https://asme.webex.com/asme/j.php?MTID=mf76b2b397325ec92e5bbf3b60c241fcc">https://asme.webex.com/asme/j.php?MTID=mf76b2b397325ec92e5bbf3b60c241fcc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join by phone 1-866-546-3377 Call-in toll-free number (Premiere) 1-712-770-4218 Call-in number (Premiere) 430 194 0708 Audio Passcode</td>
<td>Join by phone 1-866-546-3377 Call-in toll-free number (Premiere) 1-712-770-4218 Call-in number (Premiere) 430 194 0708 Audio Passcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Numbers</td>
<td>Global Numbers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>