FIMH 2025 Reviewer Guidelines

This document provides guidelines to reviewers for FIMH 2025. It is largely inspired by MICCAI guidelines.

1. General guidelines for reviews

The role of a reviewer is to identify very good papers that are of interest within the FIMH topics and tell the program committee which papers are worth discussing at oral or poster sessions. A good review expresses an opinion about the paper and identifies strengths and weaknesses of the paper.

The components of the reviewing form can be as follows:

- A quick summary of the paper: a few sentences telling the context, contributions, what the authors did, how they did it, and what were the main results.

- The opinion of the reviewer about the major strengths of the work. For instance, if a method is novel, explain what aspect is novel and why this is interesting.

- The opinion of the reviewer about the major weaknesses of the paper with some details. For instance, if a method is not novel, provide citations to prior work. Please be reasonable regarding citations to your own work.

- 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.

- Please comment about whether the paper provides sufficient details about the models/algorithms, datasets, results and evaluation.

- Are the results compared with prior works? Are results supported by proper statistical significance analysis?

- Detailed constructive comments should be provided to help the authors to improve their paper. Minor problems, such as grammatical errors, typos, and other problems that can be easily fixed, should also be listed.

- Your recommendation whether to accept or reject the paper. Does the material present an interesting contribution to the FIMH Community? The contribution may be of different nature: novel algorithm, development with a high clinical impact, an application of existing methods to a new problem, and new insights into existing

methods. Please note that FIMH particularly welcomes promising contributions of young PhD Students to encourage their first research steps.

- The following can be included in the "Confidential Comment to decision-makers":
  - If your evaluation is positive indicate to your opinion if the proposal is better suited to an oral session or a poster session.
  - Finally, indicate your opinion whether an extended version of the paper could fit some possible FIMH-related special issues in a prestigious journal.
  - If your expertise is limited to a particular aspect of the paper, this should be brought to the attention of the Program Chairs.

2. Some remarks

- The paper should be evaluated as submitted. The authors have a limited room to add any further results, figures, or text: practically, the authors have ~2 weeks to revise the paper and can extend the initial submission typically not more than by 2 pages.

3. FIMH topics
The contributions can be related but not limited to:

- anatomical and functional cardiac imaging methods, and associated novel image analysis tools;
- anatomical, statistical, physical and physiological modeling of the heart;
- computer aided diagnosis, surgery, robotics and image-guided therapy;
- simulation tools and resources for cardiac modeling, as well as experimental validation studies;
- preclinical/clinical imaging and modeling methods related to fetal, pediatric and adult heart diseases (acquired and congenital).

4. Formal Rules
Confidentiality: You have the responsibility to protect the confidentiality of the ideas represented in the papers you review. FIMH submissions are by their very nature not published documents. The work is considered new or proprietary by the authors. Authors are allowed to submit a novel research manuscript that has been archived for future dissemination (e.g., on the arXiv or BioRxiv platforms). Sometimes the submitted material is still considered confidential by the authors' employers. Sending a paper to FIMH for review does not constitute a public disclosure. Therefore, it is required that you strictly follow the following recommendations:

- Do not show the paper to anyone else including colleagues or students, unless previously discussed with the FIMH Program Chairs. We are supportive of students having the opportunity to gain initial experience with a review process. However, will need to assure that they will be subject to the same confidentiality.
- Do not show any results, videos/images or any of the supplementary material to non-reviewers.

- Do not use ideas from a paper that 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.

Conflicts of interest: The blind reviewing process will help hide the authorship of papers. If you recognize the work or the author and feel it could present a conflict of interest, decline the review and inform the Program Chairs. You have a conflict of interest if any of the following situation:

- you belong to the same institution or have been at the same institution in the past five years,
- you co-authored together in the past five years,
- you hold or have applied for a grant together also in the past five years,
- you currently collaborate or plan to collaborate,
- you have a business partnership,
- you are relatives or have a close personal relationship.

5. Anonymization Rules
FIMH follows a double-blinded reviewing process, according to which anonymity should be preserved for both sides, i.e. reviewers and submitting authors. Anonymity should be kept in mind, during the paper submission, and review process.
Ensuring Anonymity: Papers violating the guidelines for anonymity may be rejected without further consideration. At the same time, reviews that reveal the reviewer's identity are likely to have lower impact in the PC's decision process. Please keep the following in mind during the reviewing process:

- Authors are asked to take reasonable efforts to preserve their anonymity during the reviewing process, including not listing their names, affiliations, websites and omitting acknowledgments. All this information will be included in the camera-ready and published version.
- Reviewers also should make all efforts to keep their identity invisible to the authors.
- Reviewers should not ask authors to cite their papers unless it is essential (e.g., the author is expanding on the reviewer's previous work or is using their dataset); this is unprofessional and also compromises the reviewer's anonymity.
- If you accidentally discover the identity of the authors of a paper, make every effort to treat the paper fairly. It is NOT acceptable to accept or reject a paper based on the prior bias a reviewer might have about its authors.
- Please report any potential breach of the anonymization rules in your assigned reviews.

ArXiv papers: with the increase in popularity of publishing technical reports and arXiv papers, sometimes the reviewer may know the authors of a paper.

- Reviewers should not attempt to identify authors based on arXiv submissions or other publicly available technical reports. If the reviewer accidentally uncovers the authors' identity via arXiv, it should not influence their review.

- ArXiv papers are not considered prior work since they have not been peer-reviewed. Therefore, citations to these papers are not required and reviewers should not penalize a paper that fails to cite an arXiv submission.

Thank you, in advance, for your efforts and contributions to this review process.

FIMH 2025 Program Chairs