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OVERVIEW

• Who are the Veterinary Radiology & Ultrasound editors?
• What rules did we use as the basis for our review procedures?
• What are our review procedures?
• What are the opinions of VRU journal users regarding the review process?
VRU EDITORS IN CHIEF

Harker Rhodes 1959-1979
Don Thrall 1980-2012
Jeri Jones 2013-present
2017 VRU Editorial Board

Lucinda Ayres (Managing Ed.)
Don Thrall (Consulting Ed.)
Stephen Werre (Consulting Ed. Statistics)
Meredith Krebs-Smith (Wiley Ed. Global Research)

Susanne Boroffka (AE, EAVDI)
Robert Nicoll (AE, AAVDI)
John Farrelly (AE, ACVR, RO)
Pete Scrivani (AE, ACVR)
Gabriela Seiler (AE, ACVR)

Lorrie Gaschen (AE, IVRA)
Matthieu Spriet (AE, ACVR, LADIS)
Chris Lamb (AE, ECVDI)
Michelle Turek (AE, ACVR, RO)
Wilfried Mai (AE, ACVR)
Henry van Bree (AE, ECVDI)
Angela Marolf (AE, ACVR)
Junghhee Yoon (AE, IVRA)
Federica Morandi (AE, ACVR)
Allison Zwingenberger (AE, ECVDI)
VRU EDITORIAL BOARD ROLES

- Advise EIC on policies and procedures
- Advise EIC on author guideline revisions
- Serve as content reviewers
- Serve as judges for ACVR Resident Author Award papers
- Serve as liaisons for represented organizations
- Serve as guest editors for special issues
- Contribute editorials on selected topics
VRU Editorial Board Meetings

- Subscribers
- Publisher
- Reviewers
- Journal owners
- Authors
- Updates in best practices

Revise policies, procedures and author guidelines
WHAT BEST PRACTICES GUIDELINES DO WE USE?
WHAT BEST PRACTICES GUIDELINES DO WE USE?
What best practices guidelines do we use?

[Image of the EQUATOR Network webpage, which includes a library for health research reporting and essential resources for writing and publishing health research.]
WHAT BEST PRACTICES GUIDELINES DO WE USE?

COPE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS

Promoting integrity in research publication

COPE is a forum for editors and publishers of peer reviewed journals to discuss all aspects of publication ethics. It also advises editors on how to handle cases of research and publication misconduct. Read more about COPE...
What’s our review process for first submissions?

1. Managing editor
   - Admin checklist criteria met?

2. Editor in chief
   - EIC checklist criteria met?

3. Associate Editor and Peer Reviewers
   - Content revisions needed? Recommendations for decision?

4. Editor-in-Chief
   - Additional reviews needed? Final decision?
WHAT ITEMS ARE ON THE MANAGING EDITOR’S ADMIN CHECKLIST?

• iThenticate report to EIC
• Blinded and unblinded versions submitted?
• Appropriate Forms Received?
• Color Figures fee OK?
• Author wants consideration for ACVR Resident Author Award?

• Tables formatted as per guidelines?
• Abstract included in main document?
• Figures formatted as per guidelines?
• Corresponding author in S1 matches title page?
WHAT ITEMS ARE ON THE EIC CHECKLIST?

• Standard English?
• No excessive duplication of previously published content in originality report?
• Formatting and content consistent with VRU author guidelines?
• Missing details?
HOW ARE REVIEWERS INVITED?

- Associate Editor
- Library database searches
- ScholarOne database
- Recommendations by authors and other invited reviewers.
- +/- Statistical consultant
HOW ARE PEER REVIEWERS CHARGED?

- Confidentiality
- Scoring criteria
- VRU author guidelines
- ICMJE peer reviewer responsibilities
- How to use the ScholarOne system
WHAT ARE PEER REVIEWERS ASKED TO PROVIDE?

- Conflict of interest disclosure
- Detailed content checking and constructive critique
- Scoring for each of the VRU criteria
- Recommendations
WHAT ARE THE SCORING CRITERIA FOR VRU?

- originality, novelty
- significance, importance
- scientific quality, hypothesis, experimental design
- interest for VRU readers
- composition, clarity, and organization
- adherence to VRU author guidelines
HOW ARE PEER REVIEWS EVALUATED?

- Timeliness = within 28 days
- Relevance
  - Scores saved in ScholarOne database and considered for repeat invitations
WHAT CRITERIA ARE USED FOR SCORING REVIEW RELEVANCE?

- Line by line fact checking
  - errors, flaws in study design or logic, unclear statements, missing information, unclear figures
- Summary of strengths and weaknesses
- Constructively phrased recommendations for authors
- Bases for scores and acceptance recommendations explained in EIC comments

What’s the review process for revised papers?

**Revised** paper and author responses to comments

**Associate Editor/Peer Reviewers**

- Other changes needed?  
- Recommendation for decision?

**Editor-in-chief**

- Stats consult needed? Final decision?
WHAT FACTORS OTHER THAN PEER REVIEWER INPUT ARE CONSIDERED FOR THE FINAL DECISION?

• Independent review
• Journal mission
• Preferred manuscript types
• Input from Consulting Editor of Experimental Design and Statistics
WHEN IS INPUT FROM VRU’S CONSULTING EDITOR FOR EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND STATISTICS SOUGHT?

• When AE or peer reviewers request one
• When peer reviewer input is highly discordant
• When I have personal concerns about the study design or statistics
WHAT DO I DO IF A READER EXPRESSES CONCERNS ABOUT A PUBLISHED PAPER?

- Email authors and relay the anonymized concerns
- Offer authors response choices based on severity of concerns
VRU SURVEY OF USER OPINIONS 2016

- Objectives: Determine current needs of authors, reviewers, and subscribers for journal strategic planning
VRU SURVEY OF USER OPINIONS 2016

• Survey questions and answered developed based on consensus
  • Industrial organizational psychologist
  • VRU Editorial Board
  • ACVR Executive Council
  • Wiley publishers
  • Clemson Institutional Review Board
VRU SURVEY OF USER OPINIONS 2016

- Survey questions incorporated into Qualtrics software platform
  - https://www.qualtrics.com
- Draft survey sent to VRU Editorial Board for testing
VRU SURVEY OF USER OPINIONS 2016

• Final draft survey developed based on input
• Survey invitation email with explanation and Qualtrics link sent to listserv managers for all VRU represented organizations
Survey reminders sent to listserv managers for each organization 3 times during study period of January to June 2016

Survey advertised on ACVR webpage and ACVR newsletter
Number of Respondents Identifying Themselves as Members of Represented Organizations

- ACVR: 196
- ECVDI: 180
- EAVDI: 90
- IVRA: 65
- AAVDI: 6
Age Range

- <35: 18%
- 36-45: 29%
- 46-55: 23%
- >55: 19%
- Missing: 11%
Geographic Location

- Europe: 36%
- North America: 60%
- All Others: 4%
Proportion of male and female respondents in academic and private practice jobs

- **Academic**: 50 males, 70 females
- **Practice**: 57 males, 76 females
- **Other**: 15 males, 9 females

Male | Female
--- | ---
Academic | 50 | 70
Practice | 57 | 76
Other | 15 | 9
78.9% of Respondents Agree or Strongly Agree that VRU Mission Statement Reflects their Needs
66% of Respondents Agree or Strongly Agree with Changing to Double-blind Review
Satisfaction with journal quality (mean scores, 5= strongly agree)
Satisfaction with journal quality, cont.
(mean scores, 7= strongly agree)

- Organization
- Quality of Articles
- Quality of Figs & Tables
- Journal Scope
- International Coverage
Satisfaction with feedback on submitted papers (mean scores, 5= strongly agree)

- Timely
- Comprehensive
- Insightful
- Constructive
- Accurate
- Helpful

Academic vs. Practitioner
Reasons for Submitting to a Journal Other than VRU (select any that apply)

- Content Better Suited: 56%
- Higher Impact Factor: 26%
- Broader Readership: 26%
- Submission Process: 14%
- Better Reputation: 11%
- Open Access: 8%
- Lower fees: 7%

% of all respondents selecting this response
• Conclusions
  • Respondents came from a wide range of age groups and were relatively evenly split as far as gender and employment category (academia/private practice)
VRU SURVEY OF USER OPINIONS
2016

• Majority of responders agreed that the mission of the journal reflected their needs
• Majority of responders favored converting to a double-blind review system
VRU SURVEY OF USER OPINIONS 2016

• Overall satisfaction with journal quality was good to very good
• Overall satisfaction with feedback quality was fair to good
• Private practice respondents generally had more positive impressions of the journal than academic respondents
Majority of responders who submitted their papers elsewhere based their choice on subject matter fit, journal impact factor, and breadth of readership
ROLE OF THE EDITOR IN THE REVIEW PROCESS

"If the article is good, help the authors. If the article is bad, help the journal."

Ref: Quote in a WAME listserv email, source unknown

Questions?
jalj@clemson.edu