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Agenda

• What does an editor look for in a manuscript
• What does a good Research Article look like
• Journal Selection
• Open Access Publishing
• Publication Ethics
• What is the Editorial Process
  • Submission
  • Peer review
    • Editor perspective
    • Reviewer perspective - How to be a good reviewer
  • Manuscript Revision
• Questions (any time...)

What does an editor look for:

- **“Novelty”**
  - Readership interest
  - Downloads
  - Citations – Impact Factor
  - Alternative Metrics (Altmetrics)

- **Direct implications for management of disease**
  - Is it going to change clinical practice?
  - Does it just confirm what we already know
  - Is it simply bigger numbers of patients?

- **Study quality –**
  - Design
  - Healthy volunteers/Patients?
  - Single ethnicity/gender/age, locality
  - Treatment period, follow-up – sufficient to detect hard endpoints and/or safety signals?
Current Safety Concerns with Human Papillomavirus Vaccine: A Cluster Analysis of Reports in VigiBase®
Altmetrics

United States  108  24%
United Kingdom  19  4%
Japan  11  2%
Spain  9  2%
Canada  8  2%
Ireland  8  2%
Sweden  8  2%
Australia  7  2%
Netherlands  5  1%

Readers on
13 Mendeley
Study Design

- SR: Systematic Review
- MA: Meta Analysis
- RCT: Randomised Clinical Trial

Observational Studies

- Cohort Studies
- Case-Control Studies
- Case Series
- Case Reports
- Opinions/Editorials
Reasons Editors may reject paper *before* review

- Saves time
- Lacks novelty/impact
- May have published a similar paper recently, or have one in the pipeline
- May be out of scope of the journal
- May have too much copy already in the journal
- They may not think it will be highly cited
- Plagiarism - iThenticate
- Duplicate publication/Salami slicing
What do you do next, after rejection before peer review?

- Look at **reasons** provided for rejection
- Consider asking journal/editor for details/reasons
- Could just be the wrong journal...
  - Why did you choose this journal?
    - Impact factor?
    - Time pressure?
- Change what you can, based on feedback for example:
  - Style/layout
  - Language/writing
  - Discuss/interpret limitations better
Technical Quality

• It is not the job of the Editor or reviewers to fix language and structural deficiencies (not before acceptance anyway...)

• Get someone to read the paper
  • Perhaps someone outside your field?
  • English language quality

• Read instructions for authors (IFA) – on journal homepage

• Scope

• Pre-submission enquiries welcome
  • Saves time and effort
Pre-submission Enquiry example 1 (Details removed for anonymity)

I am writing on behalf of XXXX, to determine your interest in a manuscript that he and his co-author would like to submit to Drugs R&D.

The manuscript describes the results of 2 randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trials evaluating XXXXXXXX administered 4 times/day for 7 days. Study 1 was conducted in healthy volunteers to evaluate XXXXXXXX tolerability, and study 2 evaluated efficacy and safety in adults with XXXXXXXX symptoms.

Results of study 1 showed that treatment with XXXXXXXX was well tolerated with regards to local XXXXX tolerability criteria. Study 2 subsequently found that although treatment was also generally safe and well tolerated in symptomatic patients, it did not significantly reduce XXXXX symptoms or overall XXXXX symptoms relative to placebo. **Despite the failure to demonstrate efficacy, we believe that the overall learnings are worthwhile to share with others and are hopeful that the paper would be of interest to your readership.**

Please let us know if you would be interested in receiving this manuscript for review in consideration for publication in Drugs R&D.
Pre-submission Enquiry example 2

Amitabh Prakash, MD
Editor-in-chief
Clinical Pharmacokinetics

Dear Dr Prakash,

On behalf of Dr XXX and coauthors, please find attached the abstract of a research paper we would like to submit to Clinical Pharmacokinetics. Could you kindly let us know if the topic fits with the aims and scope of the journal and if you would consider it for publication?

Best wishes and thanks,
XXX
Assessing Research Articles

1. Cover Letter
2. Title
3. Abstract
4. Introduction
5. Methods
6. Results
   • Each Element should be excellent
   • Don’t neglect any one part
7. Discussion
8. Conclusion
9. Figures
10. Tables
11. References
12. Acknowledgment & disclosures
Tutorials

You could spend hours on how to write the “perfect” manuscript – if there is such a thing
http://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials

Author & reviewer tutorials

Why is publishing your work important?
Perhaps you need to publish in order to graduate, get a job, or advance your career. But consider two of the most important aims of scientists:
• To add to the body of human knowledge
• To help yourself and others understand the nature of the universe

Your research is not complete until it has been published
You can’t accomplish these goals without publishing. After all, the main way that others learn about your work is through your published articles. If you don’t publish, other researchers can’t build on your work; it will be as if you never did the research.

Start e-learning now:
» Writing a journal manuscript
» Submitting a journal manuscript and peer review
» Writing in English
» How to Peer Review
» Open Access

We have tutorials featuring interactive quizzes with great advice and detailed learning materials to help you to: write, submit and publish your manuscript; become a peer reviewer; and learn about open access. Take our quizzes today!

Explore our tutorials in your language

¿Habla Español?
Vous pouvez accéder à ces contenus en espagnol.

Você fala português?
Você pode acessar este conteúdo em português.

讲中文？
您可以阅读此教程的中文版。
Cover Letter

• Don’t underestimate
• Chance to address the editor personally
• Addressed to the correct journal and editor
• What did you do/why
• Why is your work important/novel
• Why this journal
• Don’t exaggerate or overstate results
• Previously submitted?
• Reviewer comments?
Cover Letter – Bad example

We submit the article, “XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX” for consideration of publication in your journal.

The results presented in this paper have not been published previously in whole or part, except in abstract form.

We hope this manuscript will be read and discussed widely, and look forward to your comments and suggestions.

Thank you for considering our manuscript.

• This letter says nothing and adds no value to the Editor
Dear Dr. M. Chopra,

Please find attached a manuscript by XXX et al. entitled “XXX” which we wish to be considered for publication in Targeted Oncology, as a Research Article.

In this study, we report exciting results regarding whether and how etoposide regulates the expression of BRCA1 in breast cells. We used 5 breast cell lines as normal, sporadic or BRCA1 mutated models. We could demonstrate that treatment with etoposide markedly enhances both cytoplasmic BRCA1 and nuclear phosphorylated BRCA1 expressions in aggressive breast cancer cells exhibiting a BRCAness phenotype. The function of BRCA1 in DNA damage pathway of aggressive breast cancer cells may link to apoptosis. Moreover, cytoplasmic BRCA1 expression, before etoposide treatment, has potential to be a predictive biomarker in breast cancers. Consequently we feel that the new data in our manuscript will be of particular interest to readers of Targeted Oncology, both researchers and clinicians.

This study has not been published previously, nor is it currently being considered for publication elsewhere. All authors are aware and agree with the content of the paper and of its submission. We have no conflict of interest associated with this research to disclose. We hope that the reviewers share our enthusiasm for these new data and look forward to receiving their comments. Yours sincerely, XXX
Dear Dr. van Rensburg,

On behalf of our research team, I am pleased to resubmit our Manuscript entitled, “XXX" to Drugs in R&D.

This report describes a retrospective subset analysis of elderly patients in the phase III trial reported by XXXXX. We believe that our report is of interest to your readers because physicians are often hesitant to treat elderly patients with advanced NSCLC, regardless of medical fitness.

The phase III trial that was analyzed retrospectively in this work was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and Good Clinical Practice guidelines. Written informed consent was obtained.

All authors participated in the writing and/or critical revision of the manuscript and approved the final version for submission.

Thank you for your further consideration to publish our manuscript in Drugs in R&D.

Regards,

XXX
Dear Prof. Peters,

I am pleased to submit the enclosed manuscript to your prestigious journal, to be considered for publication as a full-length systematic review. This is the result of a project performed by the Group “XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX”, sponsored by the 6th World Workshop of Oral Medicine. The mission of our group was to perform systematic reviews on Medication-induced Salivary Gland Dysfunction. One of the main results of our work was the preparation of an update evidence-based list of medications inducing salivary dysfunction, mainly xerostomia.

The medications are classified according to the ATC code, the level of evidence (based on e.g. RCTs or other studies) and the type of effect (subjective or objective dry mouth, etc.). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic review on this topic. The currently available guides are not the result of systematic reviews.

I confirm that the manuscript has not been submitted or is not simultaneously being submitted elsewhere, and that no portion of the data has been or will be published in proceedings or transactions of meetings or symposium volumes. I hope you will find the work of interest for publication. Yours sincerely
Structure of a good Research Article

Title:
- Intervention, subjects, design - descriptive
- Doesn’t need to be catchy
- Perhaps not a question... OR results...
- Not too long – keep in mind Google (70 characters..)
- Avoid uncommon abbreviations

Components:
- Prevention of thromboembolism
- Prevention of *venous* thromboembolism
- **Edoxaban** in the prevention of venous thromboembolism
- Edoxaban in the prevention of venous thromboembolism *in patients undergoing total knee replacement*
- Edoxaban in the prevention of venous thromboembolism in patients undergoing total knee replacement: *a randomized, double-blind, multicentre trial*
Abstract

- The majority of people will only read this section
- This is the first/only part of the paper the editor and reviewers read
- It must be able to ‘stand alone’
- An accurate summary of your research and conclusions reached: describe the objective, methods, summarize the results, state the principal conclusion/s
- Word Limit?
- Structure correctly according to journal style
- Keywords
Introduction

- Your manuscript tells a story..
- Why is this topic important
- What are the current gaps
- What is your objective
Methods

- How Primary endpoint, How secondary endpoint
- **Who or what was used in the study?**
  - Participants/samples
  - Inclusion and exclusion criteria
  - Materials (where purchased)
- **How you conducted the study**
  - Methodology and techniques
  - Reference standard methods and describe new techniques
  - Study design and controls
- **How you analysed your data**
  - Quantification methods/software
  - Statistical methods
- Details should be sufficient for a reader to replicate your work
- Include ethics approval, trial registration
Structure of a good Research Article

Results

• Logical flow
• Primary endpoint, secondary endpoint
• Only give results that are in the methods
• Give results for all methods
• Don’t discuss results here
• Use Tables and Figures to replace text

Discussion

• Answer objective (from introduction)
• How does it compare to other literature
• If different, why?
• Limitations
• Discuss all results
• Implications
Structure of a good Research Article

Why this study needs to be done

What you did

What you found

How your study will advance the field

Introduce topic

Currently published studies

Problem in the field

Objectives

Methodology

Results and figures

Summary of findings

Interpretation of findings

Implications for the field

Logically link your ideas throughout your manuscript
Structure of a good Research Article

Conclusion
• Lead the reader’s thoughts
• Strong and definite
• Must be supported by the data
• Don’t repeat discussion or results
• Keep brief

References
• Relevant
• Current
• Indicates if it is an active area
• Source for peer reviewers
Figures

• “Clarity trumps beauty”
• Think about colours
• Easy to understand
• Legends must be informative and should be able to “stand alone” (should not have to consult the main text to understand the data)
• Use Original or get permission
Tables

- Tables are a concise and effective way to present large amounts of data
- Don’t repeat data in text
- Should be able to “stand alone”
- Check Instructions for Authors for number of tables
- Legends must be self-explanatory
- The following is an example of a well-designed table:
  - Clear and concise legend/caption
  - Data divided into categories for clarity
  - Sufficient spacing between columns and rows
  - Units are provided
  - Font type and size are legible
Acknowledgements and disclosures

• Contributors who did not meet the authorship criteria
• Writing assistance (if any) and funding for it
• Disclose source of funding for study
• All potential conflicts of interest
Journal Selection

- Aims and scope
  - Check journal website
  - Browse the content they publish for quality and relevance to your field – be realistic
- Types of articles
  - Original research/Review Article/ Case studies?
- Reputation
  - Impact factor, Rejection rates
  - Editorial Board/previous authors
  - Be objective about how important your research is
    - Local or International journal?
  - Indexing – Medline and other established databases
  - Who is the publisher?
- Beware of predatory Open Access publishers
Journal Selector Tools:

- Springer Journal Suggester - [https://journalsuggester.springer.com/](https://journalsuggester.springer.com/)
- Other services:
  - EDANZ - [https://www.edanzediting.com/](https://www.edanzediting.com/)
  - PubsHub - [https://www.iconplc.com/innovation/pubshub/](https://www.iconplc.com/innovation/pubshub/)
  - Jane - [http://jane.biosemantics.org/](http://jane.biosemantics.org/)
  - Sylogent
Background Beta-blocker (BB) therapy after myocardial infarction (MI) reduces all-cause mortality. Objective The aim of this study was to investigate BB dosing patterns and compliance following MI. Methods Using medical patient files and nationwide databases, we identified 100 patients who were discharged following MI in 2012 from Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark, and subsequently redeemed one or more BB prescriptions within 6 months. We obtained information about all BB medication prescribed at discharge and all BB prescriptions redeemed until 31 December 2013. Daily BB doses were computed as percentages of the target doses used in clinical trials documenting the efficacy of BBs after MI. Four dose groups were defined: B12.5, [12.5-25, [25-50, and [50 % of target dose. The proportion of patients in each dose group was ascertained at and following discharge, as was the proportion that changed dose group following discharge. Results The median study period was 400 days (interquartile range [IQR] 318-486 days). At discharge, 8 % of daily doses were [50 % of target dose while 80 % were B25 % of target dose. At first prescription redemption, 71.7 % of patients moved to a higher dose group (median dose change = 33.4 % [IQR 2.0-115.1]). Still, comparing final daily doses to discharge doses, 40.2 % did not change dose group (median dose change -5.7 % [IQR -18.0 to 4.2]). Only 31.5 % reached a final daily dose [50 % of target dose. Conclusions Target dose BB treatment was
### Journal Selectors

#### Choose the language(s) you want to publish in:
- English
- Japanese
- French
- Russian
- German
- Spanish
- Italian

#### Select the publication type(s) best describing your manuscript:
- Case Reports
- Classical Article
- Clinical Trial
- Clinical Trial, Phase I
- Clinical Trial, Phase II
- Clinical Trial, Phase III
- Clinical Trial, Phase IV
- Comparative Study
- Controlled Clinical Trial
- Evaluation Studies
- In Vitro
- Journal Article
- Letter
- Meta-Analysis
- Multicenter Study
- Randomized Controlled Trial
- Review
- Twin Study
- Validation Studies

#### Choose your open access options:
- No preference
- Search only open access journals
- Exclude open access journals

#### Included only journals in PubMed Central?
- No preference
- Only journals with immediate access
- Only journals with a maximum access delay of 12 months
- Only journals in Pubmed Central

* these options only work when searching for journals

---

**Find journals**  
**Find authors**  
**Find articles**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Article Influence</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs - real world outcomes</td>
<td>High-quality open access</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Journal of dermatology</td>
<td>High-quality open access</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
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<td>Show articles</td>
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<td>International Journal of dermatology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
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<td>Indian Journal of pharmacology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The British Journal of dermatology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Journal of clinical pharmacology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia Pacific allergy</td>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of postgraduate medicine</td>
<td>High-quality open access, Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigerian Journal of clinical practice</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical reviews in allergy &amp; immunology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapeutic drug monitoring</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allergol Int</td>
<td>High-quality open access, Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pediatric dermatology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Journal of dermatology, venereology and leprology</td>
<td>High-quality open access, Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International archives of allergy and Immunology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iranian Journal of medical sciences</td>
<td>High-quality open access, PMC</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burns : journal of the International Society for Burn Injuries</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological &amp; pharmaceutical bulletin</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian J Plast Surg</td>
<td>High-quality open access, PMC</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dermatology research and practice</td>
<td>High-quality open access, PMC</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The pharmacogenomics Journal</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Clin Neurosci</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Tunisie medecale</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of immunology research</td>
<td>High-quality open access, Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orphanet journal of rare diseases</td>
<td>High-quality open access, Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clin Infect Dis</td>
<td>Medline-indexed, PMC</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Medical Journal of Malaysia</td>
<td>Medline-indexed</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Burn Care Res</td>
<td>Medline-indexed, PMC</td>
<td>Show articles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPEN ACCESS (OA)

• Open access publishing makes articles published in a journal freely and permanently available online
• Article Processing Charge $$
• Author retains copyright
  • Green OA self archiving
    • Allows publication to be freely available in parallel with any publication system
    • Authors self-archive a version in a repository/OA website (e.g. PubMed Central)
  • Gold OA publishing
    • Authors publish in an OA journal and pay an Article Processing Charge (APC)
• Two types of OA journals :
  • Full open access model
  • Hybrid model
Watch out for Predatory publishers/journals

- Do not follow proper Editorial Process
  - No peer review/Fake peer review
  - Fake Editorial Boards
- Online resources:
  - https://thinkchecksubmit.org/
    - Do you or your colleagues know the journal?
    - Can you easily identify and contact the publisher?
    - Is the journal clear about the type of peer review it uses?
    - Are articles indexed in services that you use?
    - Is it clear what fees will be charged?
    - Do you recognise the editorial board?
Dear Colleague,
Thanks for your kind attention and support.

Journal info:
Name: 
ISSN: 2333-9882
NLID: 
Frequency: Monthly
Journal DOI: 10.9734/ca
Peer-review model: Advanced OPEN peer review & Post-publication review
Publication model: Online publication and journal hard copy option
Discounted Publication charge: 30 USD (up to end of this month)
Submission deadline: up to end of this month
Present volume: vol 5
Digital Archiving: PORTICO

3. Proposed Time Schedule: Submission to first editorial decision with review comments: 3 weeks
Submission to publication: 6 weeks

4. Abstracting/indexing:
Many respected abstracting/indexing services covered our journals.
Index Medicus (IMSEAR), US National Library of Medicine (NLM) Catalog, Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education, ProQuest, HINARI (United Nation's Database), EBSCOhost (USA), Google scholar, SHERPA/RoMEO (UK), Ulrich's, CrossRef. For more information please visit here.

7. Article Processing Charge (or Publication Charge): Send your manuscript within this month and enjoy 94% discount on publication charge. Original publication charge is 500 USD. With discount you need to pay only 30 USD. Please see here for details.
Predatory Publisher examples

IF YOUR RESEARCH WORK WAS COMPLETED AND WANT TO PUBLISH YOUR RESEARCH ARTICLE IN A TRUSTED JOURNAL, THEN

DON'T WORRY !!! WE CARE FOR YOUR PAPER
SHARE YOUR SUCCESS STORY TO THE WORLD COMMUNITY
BY THE HELP OF THIS INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL AND GET A HIGH IMPACT VALUE OF YOUR PAPER

GOOD NEWS FOR AUTHORS

Submit Two articles in single article price

USE PROMO CODE : 2IN1 ON SUBJECT LINE OF YOUR EMAIL

ENJOY UPTO

50% OFF
ON PUBLICATION CHARGE (ONLINE ONLY)
Not recognised indexing databases

Focus is on payment

Horticulture, Biandry, Neuroscience, Zoology, Robotics, Food Science, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Chemical Engineering, and so on.

SJIF Scientific Journal Impact Factor 2018: 6.68; OF 3345-184X

Authors are requested to prepare their manuscript in IJDR.
Publication Ethics

- Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) - [https://publicationethics.org/](https://publicationethics.org/)
- Majority of good journals are members of COPE
- Journal Editors can also be members
- Deals with ethical issues such as:
  - Duplicate submission
  - Authorship
  - Plagiarism
  - Conflict of Interest
- “COPE is committed to educate and support editors, publishers and those involved in publication ethics with the aim of moving the culture of publishing towards one where ethical practices becomes the norm, part of the publishing culture. Our approach is firmly in the direction of influencing through education, resources and support of our members alongside the fostering of professional debate in the wider community.”
Authorship

- International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria - http://www.icmje.org/
  - Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; **AND**
  - Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; **AND**
  - Final approval of the version to be published; **AND**
  - Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

- Order of authors
- Corresponding author
- Change of authorship
Peer Review

- Editor Perspective
- Tutorials
- General Rules of Engagement
- Specific things to keep in mind
- Things to avoid
- Editor real-world feedback
- Examples..
Most scientists regarded the new streamlined peer-review process as ‘quite an improvement.’
Peer Review – Editor perspective

• Provide detailed technical assessment of the entire paper, and:
  • Assess the significance of the work in the context of the literature
  • Provides insight into clinical relevance
  • Provides rating on topicality/readership interest
• Should have minimal bias and no conflict of interest
  • Not same institution, co-authors
  • Suggested reviewers
• Timely, fair-minded and constructive
• Possess complementary expertise
  • Prefer reviewers with a number of very recent publications
  • Includes Editorial Board
• Minimum two, preferably three, often more
• Request 3 weeks, but can take much longer
Peer review – Reviewer’s perspective

• **Tutorials:**
  - [https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/howtopeerreview](https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/howtopeerreview)
  - [https://annals.org/aim/pages/reviewers](https://annals.org/aim/pages/reviewers)
  - WAME: [http://www.wame.org/about/resource-for-evaluation-of-research-articles](http://www.wame.org/about/resource-for-evaluation-of-research-articles)
  - Publons has a training course – check if you have access
Peer Review – Reviewer’s perspective

General rules of engagement

The purpose is to assist in the publication of a *balanced* manuscript that will be of interest to readers.

The editor is looking for an honest and fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript:

- Plan to spend some time on the manuscript
- Stick to the deadline (acceptable to ask for an extension early on)
- Be polite and courteous
- Offer constructive criticism
- Be specific
- Don’t go beyond your depth
- Keep it confidential
- Acknowledge assistance in the reviewing process
- Declare all potential conflicts of interest
Specific things to keep in mind

- The title accurately reflects the article content (and the study design in the case of original research)
- The objective of the review or study are clearly defined.
- The abstract is informative, providing the essence of the article clearly and concisely.
- The article is easy to read and logically structured.
- Appropriate tables and figures have been provided.
- Supporting figures and tables as ‘electronic supplementary material’
- The article adds value to the published literature.
- Appropriate quantity and quality of references
- Regardless of acceptability for publication, is this topic of low, medium, or high interest?
Things to avoid

- A detailed summary of the manuscript
- Publication recommendation in the ‘comments to the author’ section
- Exclamation marks!!
- Derogatory personal remarks
- Unfounded accusations
- Attempts to drown the ‘author voice’
- Suggestions to cite your own work simply to increase its visibility or enhance your personal citation count
Editor Feedback

• Don’t get personal – play the ball not the wo/man.
• Don’t threaten never to review again if your opinion/recommendation is outweighed/outvoted by those of the other reviewers.
• Confidential comments to the editor explaining why you think an article should be rejected are not very helpful as it’s difficult to reject the article without providing reasons to the author.
• Editors can’t keep sending articles back to reviewers until agreement is reached between authors and reviewers – at some point, they have to make a decision.
• If you’ve made a lot of comments about a manuscript and you’re rather critical of it, it really helps if you can look at the revised version/s.
• While comments on language and formatting are fine, remember that the reviewer’s main job is to appraise and comment on the content.
• If you can’t accept the invitation to review, no problem, but any suggestions you can make of other appropriate people the editor could approach are very valuable.
More Editor comments..

• If you can’t avoid being late, contact us. Not knowing what is going on or if you’re ever going to provide comments is the worst thing for editors and authors

• Specific reviewer comments are more likely to be actioned than general points, although of course the latter can also be valid

• It isn’t appropriate for reviewers to ask authors to cite the reviewer’s papers in isolation, but this happens more often than one might imagine! It may be OK to suggest authors consider including a few of the reviewer’s relevant papers amongst a list of other relevant papers, or in conjunction with other useful comments

• It isn’t necessary for reviewers to point out minor typos or grammatical errors, only highlight those where the meaning is unclear to the non-expert reader.

• It is useful if reviewers highlight if they have a lack of expertise in a particular area, e.g. if they aren’t qualified to comment on the statistics, or a particular section of the article
Examples of unhelpful reviewer reports:

“I don't think I have ever had the misfortune to dip into such a flaccid bag of elephantiasis. There are 19 references (some dubiously home grown!) and 53 pages of verbose, self-indulgent and impossibly stupid text. The 10 or 20% of usable core would need desperate resuscitative attention for any of the piece to survive. I can see no way in which the text can be improved other than incineration. As will be apparent, therefore, I can think of no comment that could be decently passed on to the authors other than a non-acceptance one.”
Examples of unhelpful reviewer reports:

• “Accept”

• “Reject! This is not a double-blind study.”

• “Thank you for asking me to review the article entitled XXXXXXXXX. This is a comprehensive review and has been well written”
Peer review – Editor Perspective

Editor faces pain rating scale:
😢 Reviewer ignores invitation
😢 declines invitation without recommending alternative
😍 recommends alternative
😠 agrees but never submits review
😔 submits poor review
😊 submits good review
😍提交s excellent review before deadline
Manuscript revision

- Address *all* reviewer comments
- Provide a reason if you disagree with a comment
- Indicate exactly where the changes in the manuscript were made
  - use coloured text, refer to page and line numbers
- Editor will act as adjudicator when there is disagreement
- Ask for extension if required
Revision

**Do you agree or disagree?**
- Why do you agree/disagree?
- Support disagreement with evidence

**What revisions were done?**
- State new experiments
- How revised the text & figures

**Where can revisions be found?**
- Page and line numbers
- Updated figure numbers
Revision

**Most common mistake**

Only state that revisions have been done, not what the revisions were.

**Make revisions easy to review**

- Briefly state what was revised
- Always refer to page and line numbers
- In manuscript, highlight revised text
Appeals

• Welcome 😊

• Sleep on it

• Be realistic – Editor is not rejecting on behalf of Science, just from the journal

• Editor’s decision is final
After Acceptance

• Deal with Production department

• Away from Editor although can contact editor if problems

• Copy editing, proofs, back and forth

• Ensure online forms are submitted

• After publication:
  • Published Erratum
  • Letters to the Editor
Thank you

Anton van Rensburg
anton.vanrensburg@springer.com

Q & A