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Session Goals

- Describe paper journey from submit to 1\textsuperscript{st} decision
- Discuss strategies to avoid “internal” rejection
- Navigate & respond to peer review comments
- Share successful strategies, Q & A
Agenda

• Large Group
  ▪ Manuscript flow
  ▪ Tips & resources

• Small Groups
  ▪ Improve an abstract
  ▪ Respond to reviewer comments, in a decision letter

• Group Discussion, Q & A
The Journey of a Paper
Editor also considers journal’s mission, space, what’s been published previously, what’s hot, etc.
Step 1: Avoiding Internal Rejection

- Select target journal when planning & during project
  - Select appropriate category
  - Follow instructions for authors
  - Write clearly, succinctly

- Write abstract as you go, revise after paper is final

- Have a great writer read your paper
What are Your Experiences of Internal Rejections

- Did you get feedback as to why – or realize why?
- Did you revise and submit elsewhere?
Group Exercise #1:
The Abstract is Critical

- **Title**  *A preparatory course improves total scores on the WCAT*

- **Table questions**
  1. Are you going to take this WCAT prep course?
  2. What other information do you want to know, in the abstract or perhaps the paper?
  3. Assuming this information is in the paper, should the paper be published?
  4. What makes you want to read (or not read) a paper?

- **Prepare to debrief** – improve this abstract
Debrief Exercise #1
The Abstract is Critical
Manuscript Review Process

- Manuscript Submitted
  - Triaged by Staff
    - Rejected
    - Technical
  - Triaged by Editor(s)
    - Rejected
    - Desk/Internal

Timeframe
- Reviewers: 20-30 days

Sent out for Peer Review

Single-blinded review: Identity of the reviewers is anonymous, but author names visible to reviewers

Double-blinded review: Identity of both the authors and reviewers is kept hidden (hard to accomplish)
Peer review process

- Goal: high quality review, content experts, thoughtful & timely
- Reviewer selection
  - Classifications
  - Reviewer ratings and workload
  - Other reviewers
- A word about classification
- Review timeline
- Alternative reviewers & un-invites
- Reviewer decisions vs. editor decisions
Search Reviewer All Reviewers - Manuscript Number JGME-D-19-#### by Classification

Manuscript Details  Register and Select New Reviewer

Change Search Type

- Search My Publication
- Search by Classification Matches

from All Reviewers

Go

The number next to each Classification term below indicates the number of Reviewers with a Classification match. By selecting the Classification term(s) you will be able to view a list of those Reviewers.

Page: 1 of 1 (3 total Classification matches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.500 Internal Medicine</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.100 Curricula</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.200 Health Disparities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page: 1 of 1 (3 total Classification matches)

Display 100 results per page.

Cancel  Submit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select As Inv.</th>
<th>Reviewer Name</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Reviewer Statistics (Agreed Invitations)</th>
<th>Invitation Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Class match with MS</td>
<td>Reviews in Progress: 1</td>
<td>Date Last Invited: 01/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed Reviews: 8</td>
<td>Outstanding Invitations: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Un-assigned After Agreeing: 0</td>
<td>Agreed: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terminated After Agreeing: 0</td>
<td>Declined: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Agreed: 01/28/2019</td>
<td>Un-invited Before Agreeing: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Completed: 02/05/2019</td>
<td>Terminated: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Declined: -</td>
<td>Total Invitations: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg Days Outstanding: 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuscript Rating: 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg Review Rating: 72.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Class match with MS</td>
<td>Reviews in Progress: 0</td>
<td>Date Last Invited: 01/27/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed Reviews: 0</td>
<td>Outstanding Invitations: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Un-assigned After Agreeing: 0</td>
<td>Agreed: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terminated After Agreeing: 0</td>
<td>Declined: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Agreed: -</td>
<td>Un-invited Before Agreeing: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Completed: -</td>
<td>Terminated: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Declined: 01/28/2019</td>
<td>Total Invitations: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg Days Outstanding: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuscript Rating: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg Review Rating: 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Class match with MS</td>
<td>Reviews in Progress: 0</td>
<td>Date Last Invited: 01/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed Reviews: 15</td>
<td>Outstanding Invitations: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Un-assigned After Agreeing: 0</td>
<td>Agreed: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terminated After Agreeing: 0</td>
<td>Declined: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Agreed: 01/31/2019</td>
<td>Un-invited Before Agreeing: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Completed: 02/14/2019</td>
<td>Terminated: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review Declined: -</td>
<td>Total Invitations: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg Days Outstanding: 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuscript Rating: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg Review Rating: 85.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This publication: Alternate Reviewer for 1 other submission*
# View Reviews and Comments for Manuscript

## JGME-D-18:

### Original Submission

Click the recommendation term to view the comments for the submission.

---

### View Manuscript Rating Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Reviewer 1)</td>
<td>Major Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reviewer 2)</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Associate Editor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Author Decision Letter**

| Author | |
|--------||
| (Author) | |

---

Page: 1 of 1 (3 total Classification matches)
Manuscript Review Process

Manuscript Submitted

Triaged by Staff

Triaged by Editor(s)

Sent out for Peer Review

Reviews Adjudicated by Editor(s)

Accepted

Rejected

Rejected

Rejected

Technical

Desk/Internal

Timeframe:
Review: 1-6 mons
Publish: 6-24 mons

Single-blinded review: Identity of the reviewers is anonymous, but author names visible to reviewers

Double-blinded review: Identity of both the authors and reviewers is kept hidden (hard to accomplish)

Editor considers journal's mission, space, what's been published previously, what's hot, etc.
Exercise #2
Responding to Reviewer Comments

- Read the reviewer comments
- As a group, create strategic responses & write down on worksheet
- Share in large group
Debrief Exercise #2
Responding to Reviewer Comments
Getting to Yes!

Kubler-Ross Stages of Major Revision

Anger
Who were these reviewers…

Denial
Seriously? There must be a mistake…
Getting to Yes!!
Kubler-Ross Stages of Major Revision

Acceptance
Just do it... *Goal is to make it better*

Depression
Why even bother – if they don’t want it...

Bargaining
I’ll just write a letter to EiC and...

Anger
Who were these reviewers...

Denial
Seriously? There must be a mistake...
What Are Your Strategies?
1. Shared goal: better manuscript

2. Responsiveness to each critique - professional
   - Review responses carefully - shift from venting!
   - Respond with affirmative change if possible - direct, don’t dance
   - Provide polite, evidence-based rebuttal comments if you disagree
     Reviewers see your responses if paper re-sent
   - Acknowledge if unable to change: +/- add to limitations
   - Visually clear format
   - Succinct
   - “We can’t respond as > word count but will add if editors wish”

3. Adhere to journal format & timeline
   - Length, structure, table/figure layout, references
   - Ask for time extension if needed
## Construct Response Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Critique</th>
<th>Our Response</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pg &amp; Line #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.1</td>
<td>Copy/Paste Ltr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONVENE THE AUTHOR TEAM

#### ASSIGN WHO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Critique</th>
<th>Our Response</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pg &amp; Line #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.1</td>
<td><strong>Important Topic - Innovative</strong></td>
<td><strong>YEAHHHHH</strong></td>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.2</td>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>Need to cut “x”, “y”. Add Table</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.1</td>
<td><strong>Scales</strong></td>
<td>Inappropriate use of scales</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.2</td>
<td><strong>Stats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td><strong>Innovative but</strong></td>
<td>Editor in E.1 noted (go with E.1)</td>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td><strong>Literature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>Our Response</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Pg &amp; Line #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.1</td>
<td>Important Topic - Innovative</td>
<td>Thank you for opportunity to revise the manuscript to further strengthen the impact of this report. We have added a number of details based on reviewer suggestions and have delineated them below.</td>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.2</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Shortened by 1,000 words</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Pg 2 L 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.1</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>We appreciate Reviewer #2’s perspective.. However, literature...</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.2</td>
<td>Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Pg 5 L 951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td>Innovative but</td>
<td>Editor in E.1 noted (go with E.1)</td>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Pg 2 L 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Abstract: shorten the Background to 1 sentence

   Done

2. Introduction: please mention the relevance of this topic to other specialties – 1 to 2 if possible

   Page 3, lines 35-40 state “Psychiatry has also experienced large increases in applications to residency and reported similar problems in scheduling and conducting interviews. (5) In response to application inflation, otolaryngology has implemented simultaneous day interviews, across all residency programs.(5-7)”

3. Results: add a Table that displays the data in the second paragraph, pg 5, which will allow reduced text and word count

   Done
Generic Manuscript Review Process

**Manuscript Submitted**
- Triaged by Staff
- Triaged by Editor(s)
- Sent out for Peer Review
- Reviews Adjudicated by Editor(s)
- Revised Manuscript
- Accepted
- Rejected

**Timeframe:**
- Review: 1-6 mons
- Publish: 6-24 mons

**Acceptance Rates:**
- JGME = 10-15%
- Acad Med = 10-15%
- Med Ed = 8-12%
- Advances = 10-15%

**Revised Manuscript**
- Generally means article will be published, if all change made
- Not a publication guarantee; editor will reconsider article & adequacy of revisions

**Moderate Revisions**
- Revise and Resubmit: Minor Revisions
- Revise and Resubmit: Major Revisions

**Rejected**
- Technical
- Desk/Internal

**Single-blinded review:**
- Identity of the reviewers is anonymous, but author names visible to reviewers

**Double-blinded review:**
- Identity of both the authors and reviewers is kept hidden (hard to accomplish)

**Editor also considers journal’s mission, space, what’s been published previously, what’s hot, etc.**

**Acceptance Rates:**
- JGME = 10-15%
- Acad Med = 10-15%
- Med Ed = 8-12%
- Advances = 10-15%

**Timeframe:**
- Review: 1-6 mons
- Publish: 6-24 mons
Discussion, Q & A
Thanks for coming!