

Attached is the long awaited INANE Guide for Nursing Editor Orientation. Please upload this document to the INANE website and advise members that INANE hopes it is of benefit to any current or aspiring editor. While this has been prepared since early 2009, we were awaiting notification from the U.S. Copyright Office.

Copyright should be shown as
JoAnn Grif Alspach, RN, EdD, FAAN
Belinda E. Puetz, PhD, RN
Cheryl Smart, MA, MBA

As discussed at our last meeting, this guide was prepared by and for INANE members for their discussion, use, and adaptation, and we release the right for reuse without permission and at no charge so long as complete citation information is noted.

Please encourage members to feel free to download and use as they wish. We intend at a later date to transfer copyright to INANE. Our intention in making this material available is to provide a resource of information useful to nurse editors at any stage of their experience that is free-of-charge to all INANE members and augmented, updated, and improved upon over time as a dynamic working document that will belong to INANE. We invite all INANE members to continue our work in modifying, refining, and yes - editing - this content, including their name or citations to indicate the source of added content.

Best wishes,
Grif, Belinda and Cheryl

INANE Guide for Nursing Editor Orientation

Initial compilation prepared by: Grif Alspach, RN EdD
FAAN

Editor, **Critical Care Nurse**

Belinda E. Puetz, PhD, RN
Editor, *Journal for Nurses in Staff
Development*

Cheryl Smart, MA, MBA
Publishing Consultant

- I. Overview of Nursing Journal Editor Role [**provided by Belinda Puetz**]
 - A. Role description – The editor is responsible for the editorial direction of the publication consistent with the mission and goals of the sponsoring professional society or the publisher.
 - B. Role affiliation
 1. Association journal – A journal can be owned by a professional society.
 2. Non-association journal – A journal can be owned by an entity other than a professional society, such as a commercial publisher.
 - C. Scope of responsibilities
 1. The Editor generally has a scope of responsibilities of the following (including, but not limited to):
 2. Formulates an annual editorial plan (i.e., 1-3 goals for the year and ideas for meeting the goals) and submits it to the appropriate group or individual for approval
 3. Works with editorial board to achieve annual editorial plan
 4. Prepares and submits a report of progress toward that year's editorial plan to the appropriate group or individual (e.g., society board of directors, publisher's representative)

5. Defines editorial procedures, as necessary, within the framework of stated publication objectives
6. Maintains regular communication with the appropriate groups or individuals, editorial board, and authors
7. Reviews position descriptions for the editorial board and submits proposed changes to the appropriate group or individual for approval
8. Identifies candidates for editorial board positions based upon stated qualifications and recommends candidates for approval, if necessary
 - ◆ Creates an orientation process for newly appointed editorial board members
 - ◆ Reviews the performance of editorial board members annually
 - ◆ Establishes date and agenda for editorial board meetings
 - ◆ Evaluates publication regularly for compliance with editorial plan
 - ◆ Reports evaluation reports to appropriate group or individual
9. Works within publication budget within defined parameters (Some editors do not have access to financial information related to their journals.)
10. Develops ongoing plans and procedures for manuscript solicitation
11. Develops guidelines for manuscript evaluation, peer review, and special features
12. Selects manuscripts for publication
13. Submits text materials and appropriate illustrations, in acceptable format, to the publication staff according to an established schedule
14. Collaborates with the publication staff regarding publication format, cover design, and number of pages per issue
15. Coordinates with the publication staff to establish production schedules for publication and special features
16. Collaborates with the publication staff to establish procedures for production processes
17. Reviews the journal galleys
18. Evaluates production processes and recommends changes to the appropriate group or individual
19. Reviews new advertisements for approval or disapproval

D. Things to know before accepting the role¹

[provided by Grif Alspach]

1. About the journal

¹ Content generously borrowed and augmented by Grif from World Association of Medical Editors. A syllabus for prospective and newly appointed editors. Available at <http://www.wame.org/resources/editor-s-syllabus>.

- ◆ Who owns the journal?
 - Owner may be a nursing association or society, a university, hospital system, government organization, nonprofit organization, commercial business, healthcare publisher, or some other entity.
 - If owner is an association, what is the full name of the association, organization, or society? Does the journal's association affiliation influence any aspect of the editor's responsibilities, reporting relationships, journal policies, procedures or operations, etc.? If so, how?
- ◆ What is the history of the journal?
 - When was it established?
 - What was its original name, mission, publication frequency, size, audience, publisher, content, format?
 - Have any of these aspects changed over time? If so, when and why?
- ◆ What is the current status of the journal?
 - Primary mission and purpose
 - Primary and secondary audiences
 - Publishing frequency
 - Written policies and procedures
 - Versions: print, online; whether content is exactly the same or differs between versions; features offered only in print version; features offered only in online version
 - Average page count
 - Limitations on number of pages per issue or per year
 - Trim size
 - Style
 - Pricing structure
 - Clinical content to advertising ratio
 - Range and flexibility of editorial / clinical content published (e.g., original research, review papers, case studies, exemplars, letters to the editor, solicited vs. unsolicited material)
 - Format and layout of articles
 - If association journal, are some pages allocated for association news or reports?

- Editorial board responsibilities, number of members, how appointed, composition
- Number and demographics of reviewers

2. About the publisher

- ◆ Who is the current publisher of the journal?
- ◆ Where is the publisher located?
- ◆ How does the publisher market and advertise for the journal?
- ◆ Will any of the publisher's marketing and advertising policies and procedures affect the editor's role? If so, how?
- ◆ What is the nature and scope of the business relationship between the publisher and editor?

3. About the previous editor

- ◆ Who was the previous editor?
- ◆ How long was the previous editor in place?
- ◆ Why did previous editor leave?
- ◆ Is the previous editor available and willing to discuss the position with a prospective successor?
- ◆ How may the previous editor be contacted?

4. About the position

- ◆ Who determines the editor's responsibilities?
- ◆ What are the editor's responsibilities?
- ◆ Is there a written job/position description for the editor?
- ◆ Does the written job description reflect all current and anticipated future expectations?
- ◆ Are any aspects of the position description unclear or problematic?
- ◆ Does the editor's position description include aspects of clerical support such as
 - Logging in manuscripts
 - Entering manuscript and author data
 - Forwarding manuscripts to reviewers
 - Sending reminders for overdue reviews
 - Processing incoming reviews

- Forwarding manuscript dispositions and reviewer comments to authors
- Troubleshooting problems with electronic submissions and forwarding of materials to authors, reviewers, production staff
- Securing permissions
- ◆ Does the editor's position description include aspects of production such as
 - Copyediting
 - Forwarding and retrieval of page proofs
 - Layout / paste-up
 - Cover design or selection
 - Copyediting
 - Layout / paste-up
- ◆ If an association journal, what degree of editorial independence exists?
 - Does the editor have sole and full editorial independence over editorial / clinical content?
 - Does the editor have sole discretion on whether a paper is accepted for publication?
 - Will any staff or board member have review or approval prerogative over the journal's final clinical content after the editor has accepted a paper for publication?

5. About the editor's contract

- ◆ Is the editor's contract a written document?
- ◆ What are the terms contained in the editor's contract?
 - Duration of contract
 - Reporting relationships: a person, committee, board of directors, president/VP, government official?
 - Scope of responsibilities
 - Compensation: pay or honorarium amount, frequency
 - Inclusion of INANE meeting attendance
 - When was it established?

6. About support provided to the editor

- ◆ Who is responsible for interviewing and hiring new staff?

- ◆ Staff
 - Assistant editor(s)
 - Managing editor
 - Copy editor
 - Clerical / administrative assistant
- ◆ Space
 - Location of journal offices: editor
managing editor
copy editor(s)
art & production staff
administrative staff
computer backup offsite
 - Storage space
 - Meeting
- ◆ Office equipment
- ◆ Computer hardware, peripherals, accessories
- ◆ Software and online manuscript tracking, e-mail, Internet access
- ◆ Office supplies
- ◆ Financial
 - Budget
 - Reimbursement for expenses
 - Overhead
 - Capital
 - Travel
 - Out-of-pocket

7. Other issues

II. Managing the Editorial Office **[provided by Belinda Puetz]**

A. Office location(s)

Many editors work from home; others from the offices provided by their primary employer. Whatever the location, it is important to have adequate work and storage space to perform the necessary editorial tasks. At a minimum, the Editor needs a desk with ample work space and storage, preferably locked.

B. Office staff

Many editors perform all the necessary editorial tasks, without assistance, but, ideally, the Editor has an assistant to whom he/she can delegate responsibilities. The advent of electronic manuscript review software has streamlined the review process, but there are many other administrative tasks that confront the Editor and assistance is welcome! Should a paid person not be available, many colleges or universities have an English, communications, or public relations department which may be interested in offering internships to qualified individuals. These students can be helpful in many tasks, such as preparing for an Editorial Board meeting, coordinating the continuing education feature process, and similar short-term, well-defined tasks.

C. Office equipment, software

Every editor needs a computer, either desk top or laptop. Dual monitors are helpful for editing (the original manuscript is displayed on one monitor and the revised version on the other monitor). Other office equipment such as a telephone, copier, and fax machine is needed. The software program that is most used is a word processing program. Electronic manuscript management systems are publisher-specific, but are effective in expediting work flow. Technical assistance should be available.

D. Work flow

Each editor will design his/her work flow based on pre-existing work habits. Helpful advice on workflow can be obtained from publishers and other editors.

E. Policies and procedures

Publishers or associations may have an established set of policies and procedures for the journal. It is the Editor's responsibility to review and adhere to these policies and procedures. The Editor may also wish to establish policies and procedures related to the Editorial Board; for example, the Editor may decide not to "overwork" reviewers by not assigning more than 1 manuscript per month or by not sending a manuscript for review when the reviewer already has a manuscript under review.

At a minimum, the Editor may wish to establish a "style manual" for the journal to ensure consistency in the editing process. For example, the Editor may have preferences such as him or her rather than him/her or he or she rather than he/she. A compilation of these preferences becomes a style manual to which everyone associated with the journal may refer.

F. Reports, record keeping

The Editor must learn early on what reports are required and by whom, whether publisher or association, and provide these as expected. Such reports may consist of the following:

- Manuscript submission rate

- Manuscripts accepted or revised
- Rejection rate
- Number of manuscripts accepted but not yet published

The Editor may also report to the Editorial Board and/or reviewers in the form of assessments of the quality of their reviews.

Obviously, the Editor must keep meticulous records in order to be able to access the data for these reports. Electronic manuscript management systems collect these data and can generate reports, but some must be manually assembled. Knowing what reports are required can help the Editor establish a mechanism to collect the necessary data on an ongoing basis.

- G. Legal issues in journal publishing (e.g., copyright, permissions) (see Section C, number 4). Copyright to the authors' work is generally transferred to the publisher, either at the time of submission of a manuscript or at the time it is accepted for publication. Information about transfer of copyright should be provided in the Information for Authors. Information about permissions should also be included in the Information for Authors. The Editor is responsible for ensuring that copyright to the manuscripts to be published in the journal has been transferred to the publisher. If the copyright agreement cannot be submitted online where there is an electronic editorial management system, the author should mail the agreement either to the publisher or to the Editor.
- H. The Editor also holds responsibility for ensuring that any permissions to reprint copyrighted material have been obtained by the author. The Editor may request that the author submit either the original or a photocopy of any permission letters. Any issues should be referred immediately to the publisher, who then may access legal counsel for assistance.

III. Managing the Editorial Process **[provided by Belinda Puetz]**

A. Participants

1. Editor – The Editor is the decision maker; the Editor is responsible for the editorial content of the journal and as such, the “buck stops” with the Editor.
2. Section editor(s) – The Editor, the society, or the publisher may appoint associate, assistant, or section editors to assist the Editor in his/her work. These individuals should not be appointed without direct input from the Editor, but often when assuming an editor position, these individuals already are in place in the journal's structure. The roles and responsibilities of these individuals should be clearly and specifically defined, and there should be performance

criteria upon which to base ongoing reviews and decisions about suitability for the position.

Decisions also will need to be made about how editors will work together, particularly if they are working remotely, how they will communicate, and how decisions on manuscripts will be made.

3. Authors – Key participants! Without authors, there would be no journal! Editors vary in their relationships with journals. Editors of society journals become aware quickly that membership and involvement in the society may be adversely affected by an individual's relationship with the journal, and, thus, the Editor strives to maintain good relationships with society members.
4. Reviewers (see Section V) – These individuals are generally volunteers to assist the Editor with peer review of manuscripts that are submitted to the journal as well as with other tasks related to the journal, such as advising the Editor on editorial direction.
5. Managing editor(s) – If in place, a managing editor is responsible for “directing traffic,” ensuring that reviews are conducted in a timely fashion, that issues are produced on schedule, and so on. The managing editor may be an employee of the society or of the publisher.

B. Editorial content

1. Subject matter – According to the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)², editorial content may be predetermined by the owner of the journal (whether a professional society or a commercial publisher) and the discipline or geographic region in which the journal is published. Editorial content also may be determined by decisions to accept or reject manuscripts on particular topics. If authors see articles on a topic in the journal, they will probably submit manuscripts on that topic. Conversely, if authors do not see articles on a topic, they may rightly or wrongly assume the journal does not want articles on that topic and, as a result, submit manuscripts on those topics elsewhere.
2. Ideally, the editor has a clear vision of what the content of the journal should include based on the journal's purpose and mission, the needs and interests of readers, the most promising areas of research in the

² World Association of Medical Editors (WAME). A syllabus for prospective and newly appointed editors, page 3. Available at <http://www.wame.org/resources/editor-s-syllabu>

field, and the extent to which the journal should try to attract and publish this research.

- ◆ Appropriate topics – The Editor, in collaboration with the publisher and reviewers, determines topics that are appropriate for inclusion in the journal and publicizes those to appropriate audiences, generally through a journal purpose or mission statement on the masthead, in the Information for Authors, on the journal website, society membership recruitment materials, and other locations.
- ◆ Appropriate formats – The Editor, in collaboration with the publisher and reviewers, also determines the formats (e.g., case studies, research manuscripts, practice commentaries) in which appropriate topics should be submitted to the journal and publicizes those to appropriate audiences.
- ◆ Editorial styles – The Editor may adopt a formal, professional style in communications or a more informal, conversational style, depending on his or her comfort level, the journal’s publisher, audience (readers), reviewers, and authors. However, the Editor may choose to be formal with certain audiences and informal with others. It is a good idea for the Editor to establish a style manual for the journal to ensure that everyone involved in the journal uses a consistent style.

C. Manuscripts

1. Types – Manuscripts submitted for publication consideration to a journal should be appropriate to the journal’s mission in content and to the journal’s style in format. Authors may not be familiar with the journal to which they wish to submit so require some guidance. Each journal should have a reference document, generally called the Information for Authors, which outlines the editorial and format requirements for manuscript submission.
2. Acquisition – Most journals accept submissions “over the transom,” or unsolicited. Manuscripts also may be solicited by the Editor or reviewers. Common sources of manuscripts for solicitation include those from presentations at conferences, publications in other venues, review boards, or society membership. It should be noted that solicitation of manuscripts does not guarantee publication.
3. Submission - Manuscripts are received in many editorial offices as “hard copies” (i.e., manuscript submissions); more recently, editorial offices have converted to electronic formats for manuscript submission; some offices accept both formats. However, manuscript

submission is the traditional method of submission. Most journals required that multiple, usually three, copies are mailed with a corresponding number of sets of figures or tables.

4. Electronic submission is usually supported by a submission program made available by the journal office. These programs can be developed “in-house” or purchased as proprietary programs. Also, authors may wish to submit their manuscripts to journals, including those that do not formally offer online submission, as simple e-mail attachments, sometimes in addition to the print copies.
5. In submitting a manuscript, according to AMWA, authors should be required to disclose to the editors all personal financial and other relationships they may have with the manufacturer of any product mentioned in the manuscript or the manufacturers of competing products.
6. The contributions of persons who are acknowledged for their assistance with the manuscript should be described, and their assent to be acknowledged should be documented
7. Tracking – Upon receipt of the submission, the Editor or designee (managing editor) should acknowledge receipt of the editorial office’s receipt of the manuscript. The acknowledgment can be issued electronically or via regular mail and should apprise the author of the projected timeframe for review of the manuscript. Some journals require that a submission checklist accompany a submission.
8. The manuscript should be identified in some way to permit ease of tracking through the process. In the event that peer review of the manuscript is anonymous (i.e., reviewers do not know the author) and “blind” (i.e., the reviewers do not know each other), a number generally is assigned to the submission and used throughout the review and publication processes.
9. The manuscript should be tracked through each step of the publication process. Electronic systems provide for this activity, but a simple spreadsheet can be developed to accomplish the same purpose if manuscript submission is by paper copy.
10. Review – Peer review journals traditionally solicit two reviews for every paper. Reviewers may be chosen from the Editorial Board or from individuals who comprise a review panel. Reviewers generally are chosen for their expertise in the topic of the submission, although occasionally a reviewer is chosen for research rather than topic expertise. Many Editors maintain a database identifying the specific areas of expertise of reviewers (e.g., Editorial Board members, others). Electronic systems provide tracking of reviewers, including number of manuscripts assigned, time elapsed for reviews, and recommendations for publication. These data make performance review simple, but similar paper systems can be set up by the Editor or adapted from those already in place.

11. It is the Editor's decision to select two, fewer, or more reviewers in each instance of manuscript submission. According to the Council of Science Editors³,
12. Occasionally only one reviewer is solicited. This could be for a range of reasons, including among others:
 - ◆ The paper is clearly not acceptable, and the Editor wishes to have a quick – perhaps preliminary, perhaps confirmatory – review prior to rejection.
 - ◆ The paper is a special article of sorts – perhaps solicited – and does not warrant full peer review.
 - ◆ The paper is highly technical and only warrants one review from a specialist.
13. The Council of Science Editors also describes situations in which three or more reviewers may be solicited to review a manuscript, such as when
 - Φ The third review is biostatistically warranted in clinical research for phase III studies, studies of prognostic factors, or epidemiologic studies, among others
 - Φ The subject is highly controversial and the editor wishes a variety of opinions
 - Φ The editor disagrees with the two reviews received and seeks a third opinion
 - Φ The two reviews received diametrically disagree with each other and the Editor wants a tie-breaker review
 - Φ One or both of the reviews received is inadequate as a review

Regardless of the number of reviewers chosen, it is important that the reviewers not have a conflict of interest, either actual or perceived, with respect to the manuscript they are being asked to review. Reviewers should be encouraged to disclose when they

- Φ Are members of the same employing institution as the author
- Φ Have a primary financial relationship with a commercial company whose products are the subject of the manuscript
- Φ Are engaged in work that is directly competitive with the author's
- Φ Believe they cannot provide an objective review of the manuscript for any reason

³ CSE Short Course for Journal Editors, 2000, San Antonio, TX, www.councilscienceeditors.org

In the event that a reviewer discloses a conflict of interest, the manuscript should immediately be assigned to another reviewer.

14. Disposition – Upon completion of the review process, the Editor makes the decision about disposition of the manuscript. Generally, the decision is to accept, revise, or reject the manuscript.
15. Scheduling – Manuscripts are scheduled for publication by the Editor or designee (e.g., managing editor).

IV. Writing Editorials **[Provided by Grif Alspach]**

A. Definition of an editorial

1. *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language*, 4th ed., ©2000 definition of an editorial (<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/editorial>) is as follows:

“An article in a publication expressing the opinion of its editors or publishers”

2. The American Medical Association *Manual of Style*, 10th ed., Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 2007 definition of an editorial is as follows:

“A written expression of opinion that may reflect the official position of the publication”

3. For many INANE members, an editorial is a written expression of our opinion as editor of our respective publication

B. Purpose of editorials: Editorials may be written for a variety of purposes- for example to

1. Inform
2. Persuade
3. Interpret
4. Promote
5. Praise or criticize
6. Entertain

C. Possible topics for editorials in nursing journals

1. Current challenges within nursing or health care
2. Current controversies
3. Illumination of neglected but important issues

4. Issuance of call to action for addressing problems
 5. Encouraging support of actions or activities
- D. Generating ideas for topics
1. Peruse national news sources for relevant reports
 2. Obtain rich site summary (RSS) feeds for online receipt of news on issues relevant to journal readers
 3. Attend local, regional, and national meetings of nursing organizations
 4. Participate in or monitor relevant online sites, listservs, or blogs
 5. Talk with nurses informally and often to identify issues important to them in their daily work
- E. Attributes of effective editorials
1. Engaging
 2. Relevant
 3. Timely
 4. Clear
 5. Focused
 6. Constructive
 7. Balanced
 8. Enlightening
 9. Fair
 10. Accurate
- F. Hints – Tips
1. Interview participants at society conventions and other venues; weave their comments into an editorial (e.g., how they will use what they learned at the convention in their practice).
 2. Ask participants in an educational session (or anywhere they are gathered in a room) for one burning, top-of-the mind issue that affects them; collect them on Index cards (that you always carry with you) and then use these issues as editorial topics.
 3. Use experiences from your “other” life (e.g., sitting on community organization boards, volunteering, attending school) as topics for an editorial that you relate to the journal’s audience.
 4. Interview society leaders and use their life stories in an editorial or several of them.

5. Keep a file of ideas for editorials; add to it constantly; select an idea of interest at the time an editorial is due.
6. Interview winners of society awards and write up their accomplishments in an editorial.

V. Managing the Peer Review Process⁴ [provided by Grif Alspach]

A. Preliminary manuscript review

1. The editor establishes the process used for review of manuscripts. A preliminary or screening review of each paper is used to determine its suitability for the journal (i.e., whether the topic, content, and format are consistent with the mission, purpose, and content targeted for the journal). Papers that do not meet these fundamental attributes do not undergo further consideration.
2. Preliminary review may also be used to screen out papers on topics already scheduled for publication or recently published, on trite or outdated topics, or on topics already extensively published by other journals in the field. Conversely, preliminary review may be used to identify papers that warrant expedited review and publication owing to their timely and/or important content.
3. If the paper meets these fundamental attributes, then other preliminary aspects such as the following may be determined in preparation for peer review:
 - ◆ All author contact information received
 - ◆ All manuscript components received
 - Title page
 - Body of manuscript
 - Reference list
 - Tables with artwork
 - Figures with artwork
 - Other: sidebars
 - Authorship, copyright transfer, permissions, conflict of interest statements

⁴ References used (see full citation in reference list) include: Goodman, Berlin, Fletcher, & Fletcher, R.H. (1994); Grayson, L. (2002); Jefferson, Alderson, Wager, & Davidoff (2002); Jefferson, Wager & Davidoff (2000); Sylvia & Herbel (2001)

- Satisfactory electronic and/or hardcopy versions of components
- 4. If the journal has assistant or associate editors, the editor determines who next reviews each paper and for what purpose(s).
- 5. The editor (unless delegated to an assistant or associate editor) assigns reviewers to critique each paper.

B. Description of peer review

1. Definition

- ◆ No consensus on definition of external peer review. Numerous definitions are available.
- ◆ *Annals of Internal Medicine* described it as “a negotiation between the author and journal about the scope of knowledge claims that will ultimately appear in print” (Goodman et al., 1994, p.4, citing Bailar & Mosteller, 1988 and Pocock, Hughes, & Lee, 1987).
- ◆ MEDLINE: Medical Subject Heading defines term as “evaluation by experts of the quality and pertinence of research or research proposals of other experts in the same field” (NLM in Sylvia, 2001).
- ◆ “... the term peer review is used to describe a number of processes, most commonly gathering opinions from external experts, but also review by in-house editors ...” (Jefferson, 2002, p. 2787).
- ◆ (Peer review is) the principal quality assurance mechanism applied to documented research (Grayson, 2002, Abstract).
- ◆ “traditionally acts as the last bastion against mediocrity, bias, error and deceptionA manuscript submitted for publication in a peer reviewed journal is referred to selected specialists in the field who offer advice on whether it should be published and what, if any, changes need to be made to bring it up to standard. It will not appear unless the changes are made to the satisfaction of both the editor and referees” (Grayson, 2002, p. 5).
- ◆ A peer-reviewed journal is defined by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors as “one that has submitted most of its published articles for review by experts who are not part of the editorial staff” (see **Peer Review** topic in International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (Updated October 2007). *Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals: Writing and editing for biomedical publication*. Available at <http://www.icmje.org/index.html>)

- ◆ What constitutes peer review varies among different journals
- 2. Purpose(s)
 - ◇ Quality assurance mechanism
 - ◇ Help ensure quality, relevance, and credibility of the journal
 - ◇ To improve the article before publication
- ◆ There is no universal consensus on the objectives or aims of peer review. Based on their reviews of studies and existing literature related to peer review, Jefferson et al. suggest its aims may be categorized as
 - ◇ (1) Selecting submissions for publication (by a particular journal) and rejecting those with irrelevant, trivial, weak, misleading, or potentially harmful content, and
 - ◇ (2) Improving the clarity, transparency, accuracy, and utility of the selected submissions (Jefferson, 2002, pp. 2787-2788.)
- ◆ Broader functions include its social and psychological effects such as increasing credibility and prestige of published work (Jefferson, 2002, p. 2789)

C. Types of peer review

1. **Unblinded:** neither the author's nor reviewers' identities are concealed. As a result, author(s) knows identity of reviewers and reviewers know identity of author. Open review process may involve reviewers signing their name to reviews they provide.
2. **Single blinded:** concealing authors' identity from reviewers. As a result, reviewers know the identity of the author(s), but author(s) do not know identity of the reviewers
3. **Double blinded:** concealing author's identify from reviewer and concealing reviewer's identify from the author. As a result, reviewers do not know identity of author(s) and author(s) does not know identity of reviewers.

D. Reviewers

1. Selection: by the editor
 - ◆ Editor is responsible for maintaining a database for reviewers that includes contact information, area(s) of expertise, and related relevant information.

- ◆ Criteria used to select reviewers include expertise and familiarity with the literature in the content area, demonstrated ability to provide thorough, constructive critique that improves manuscripts, and timely return of reviews.
 - ◆ Editors may invite prospective reviewers on the basis of expertise identified via personal acquaintance, recommendations from others, persons who volunteer to serve in this capacity, or from experts whose work is cited among a manuscript's references.
2. Responsibilities: as determined by the editor. Typically include the following:
- ◆ Providing constructive and unbiased critique of manuscript to authors
 - ◆ Returning review to editor in a timely manner
 - ◆ Providing the editor with recommendations regarding disposition of manuscript
 - ◆ Maintaining confidentiality of manuscript content and review comments
 - ◆ Notifying editor of any potential or actual conflicts of interest related to any authors or paper they are asked to review
 - ◆ Reviewers must exercise ethical integrity by refraining from use of any material sent to them for review.
3. Assignment
- ◆ Editor assigns reviewers to each manuscript.
 - ◆ Reviewer assignment influenced by a number of factors such as topic, content coverage, audience(s) addressed, writing level, number of available reviewers.
 - ◆ The number of reviewers assigned to each manuscript varies among journals, but typically at least two are designated to afford different perspectives and minimize potential for bias.
4. Support
- ◆ All reviewers need to know what expectations the editor has for them. Preparing and distributing some guidelines for manuscript reviewers can help to clarify and communicate these expectations in a consistent manner.
 - ◆ Reviewers may also require support if the manuscript review process changes or needs to adapt to a new online manuscript processing system

- ◆ Avoid overworking reviewers by limiting the number of papers sent for review, allowing sufficient time to complete reviews, making review procedures as expeditious as possible.
5. Oversight
 - ◆ Editor is responsible for the nature of peer review comments returned to authors. In this regard, editors need to consider each reviewer's comments and modify or entirely remove materials deemed as unprofessional, misleading, biased, self-serving, inaccurate, outdated, rude, personal, unduly negative, insensitive, unjustified, or otherwise inappropriate.
 6. Evaluation
 - ◆ Reviewer performance may be monitored for attributes such as quality, sufficiency, constructiveness, and punctuality of reviews.
 7. Recognition
 - ◆ Identify and publicly thank reviewers for their contributions.
 - ◆ Seek meaningful ways to recognize and reward reviewers (e.g., with complementary subscription, letters for promotion).
 8. Release
 - ◆ Avoid using reviewers who do not consistently provide useful, constructive, informative, and timely manuscript critiques.
- E. Review criteria: are usually located on a standardized manuscript review form and typically include aspects such as the following:
1. Suitability for journal
 2. Relevance
 3. Originality
 4. Importance
 5. Accuracy
 6. Clarity
 7. Efficiency of expression
 8. Timeliness
 9. Organization
 10. Depth and breadth of coverage
 11. Level of discussion
 12. Reference use, currency

13. If research report, quality and scientific merit of design, methods, statistical analysis, presentation of results, integration with existing literature, acknowledgment of limitations, data support for conclusions and implications
 14. Structural attributes: writing style, use of transitions, readability, grammar, spelling, punctuation
 15. Specific recommendations for improvement of manuscript
- F. Manuscript disposition that follows peer review
1. Recommendations versus decisions regarding manuscript disposition
 - ◆ Reviewers offer recommendations to the editor
 - ◆ Editor makes final decisions regarding manuscript disposition
 2. Manuscript disposition categories
 - ◆ Acceptance
 - ◆ Request for revision
 - ◆ Rejection
- VI. Managing the Publication Process (“inside out- from publisher’s perspective”)
[provided by Cheryl Smart]
1. Types of publishing relationships
 - * There are many publishers that have dedicated divisions related to medicine, dentistry, allied health, and nursing. Among the best known are (in alphabetical order): Blackwell, Elsevier, Jannetti, Lippincott, Sage, Slack, and Springer. In addition, some associations self-publish or maintain publishing divisions, including the American Association of Critical Care Nurses and the Oncology Nurses Society, to name only two.
 - *Ownership of a journal is defined by its copyright. General types of ownership include
 - ◆ Society owned, society published
 - ◆ Society owned, commercial publisher
 - ◆ Owned and published by commercial publisher
 - ◆ University published
 2. The publisher’s role
 1. The periodical publisher is directly responsible for the administrative management, oversight, and direction of products and/or product lines. Among their responsibilities are acquisition and development of

periodicals, management of the publication through its life cycle, and assessment of a publication's viability through its life cycle. While responsibilities vary from publisher to publisher (whether commercial, university, or society) generally the duties involve the following:

- ◆ The publisher is the liaison between an editor and publishing house/owner/society as well as the liaison to editorial or publications committee(s) and, if society-owned, the executive director and/or board of directors.
- ◆ The publisher reviews contractual requirements across all facets of publishing (production, editing, design, finance, advertising, subscriptions) and coordinates same as appropriate with the editor, often being the person to report on these facets of the journal to a society or other owner.
- ◆ The publisher generally prepares or assists in preparing an annual financial target and budget progress throughout the year, reporting as appropriate to the society or owner, with appropriate information to the editor. (It is important to note here that the editor is neither always fully informed nor responsible regarding the financial aspects of a journal, just as the publisher is segmented from the editorial peer review and mission process. Keeping the financial and editorial aspects separate provides for editorial integrity, so long as the editor understands aspects necessary to the health of the journal).
- ◆ The publisher and the editor work together on publishing plans, including common mission and goals for editorial, and in some cases, subscriptions, advertising, and marketing commitments.
- ◆ The publisher is usually responsible for negotiations/contract renewals for the journal ownership/publishing relationship(s), in some cases including the editor's role and responsibility, termination requirements, copyrights, licensing rights, reprint rights, production/editorial specifications, warranties, billing/membership handling procedures, advertising/editorial ratios and policies, back issue handling, inventory management, postal requirements, international edition considerations, page charges, and in some cases editorial board meetings and society relationships, special issue handling, payment of suppliers and editor(s)/editorial board, and other points specific to each journal.
- ◆ The publisher should be well informed regarding the market through appropriate market analysis, an area in which the editor may contribute professional information or sources.
- ◆ Dependent upon the publisher, financial information regarding the journal is sometimes shared (and sometimes not). There are reasons that publishers do not always share that information,

including tradition, confidentiality, competitive environment, control, business requirements, and concern for editorial integrity.

- ◆ The publisher is often responsible for deciding when a journal should not only be launched, but when it should be terminated. Factors considered include reader/market surveys, interviews, manuscript level projections, subscriber level projections, recognition in the field, competitive products, and relationship to an association, and so on.

3. Traditional or online publishing and the role of copyediting

- a. Traditionally (and as noted above in Section 3(C)) manuscripts were submitted in hard copy to the publisher's office after the editor's office has logged in, added to reports, subjected to peer review and revision, and accepted. The publisher would also log in the manuscript and assign in a reference number, at which point it would be into a queue for copyediting (behind earlier submitted manuscripts). When it reaches the front of the queue, the copyeditor edits according to the style selected for the journal (e.g., AMA, APA, Vancouver) and any special style points decided upon by the editor (for example, use of specific abbreviations specific to the specialty). Until a few years ago, submission and editing was done on "hard copy"; now, even if an editor is not using an electronic manuscript system, most submit manuscripts electronically and they are edited electronically.
- b. There are a number of electronic manuscript processing systems, Internet-based tools that work on multiple platforms making access to manuscript review available 24 hours a day. Some of the more familiar include systems include Editorial Manager, the proprietary system created by Aries Systems Corporation and used by Wolters Kluwer, University of Chicago Press, and others and Elsevier Editorial System, used by Elsevier. The main competing systems are Manuscript Central (built by ScholarOne, which was acquired by Thomson several years ago), eJournalPress and BenchPress (created by Highwire). While similar across the board, there are cost variations and report variations, but most electronic systems
 - i. allow for faster peer review times
 - ii. provide editors with a comprehensive system to support the entire review process
 - iii. allow for online submission by authors, as well as access regarding article status through the process
 - iv. provide some level of customer support
 - v. allow for correspondence and data for each submission to be stored electronically, obviating the need for paper files
 - vi. provide "suggest reviewer" features under topical classifications and store reports on reviewer performance/time

- vii. allow for some level of customization
 - viii. provide training for editors
- c. A word about copyediting: Publisher copyediting is generally not considered “rewriting” and often does not include checking references. These are two aspects of developing a manuscript that generally fall within the editor’s purview, but the topics should be discussed and expectations clarified between publisher and editor. The experienced copyeditor will edit for style and syntax, attempting to maintain the voice of the author.
- d. Offshore editing versus internal editing: Another area of change is the move to offshore editing. Many of the larger publishers have already incorporated this into their production schedule in order to lower costs. Offshore editing, which may mean that someone is editing in a second language, necessitates effort on the editor’s part to ensure that the manuscript submitted really is “ready for editing.”
- e. In-house editing is also highly variable depending on publisher, association, but in all cases, the degree of copyediting is highly dependent upon the level of ability of the author, the requirements of the journal, the expectations of the audience, and the time commitment of the editor.

4. Managing Potential or Actual Author, Reviewer, or other Publication Participant Misdeeds [provided by Grif Alspach]

- a. Policies and procedures should be in place to afford direction on how potential or actual author misdeeds are handled.
- b. At a minimum, Editors have a responsibility to investigate and follow-up on all allegations of author (or reviewer) misbehavior.
 - 1. Solicit the facts of the situation.
 - 2. Communicate these facts to the accused person(s) with a request for explanation, clarification, or reply, as appropriate.
 - 3. Make every attempt to resolve issues prior to publication of related material.
 - 4. If related material has been published, a notice to readers regarding the misdeed, retraction of article, and/or apology to readers may also need to be published. Editor may work with Editorial Board, legal counsel, association staff, and others to satisfactorily resolve substantive legal, ethical, and professional issues.
- c. A more detailed and specific consideration of this issue is provided by the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) and updated periodically (<http://www.wame.org/resources/publication-ethics->

[policies-for-medical-journals#peer](#)). Current content from that source follows:

Responding to Allegations of Possible Misconduct

Journals should have a clear policy on handling concerns or allegations about misconduct, which can arise regarding authors, reviewers, editors, and others. Journals do not have the resources or authority to conduct a formal judicial inquiry or arrive at a formal conclusion regarding misconduct. That process is the role of the individual's employer, university, granting agency, or regulatory body. However, journals do have a responsibility to help protect the integrity of the public scientific record by sharing reasonable concerns with authorities who can conduct such an investigation.

Deception may be deliberate, by reckless disregard of possible consequences, or by ignorance. Since the underlying goal of misconduct is to deliberately deceive others as to the truth, the journal's preliminary investigation of potential misconduct must take into account not only the particular act or omission but also the apparent intention (as best it can be determined) of the person involved. Misconduct does not include unintentional error. The most common forms of scientific misconduct include (the following are taken with minor modification from the ORI publication *Analysis of Institutional Policies for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct* [<http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/polanal2.htm>, full report in PDF format <http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/publications/studies.asp>, accessed 3/13/04]):

- **Falsification of data:** ranges from fabrication to deceptive selective reporting of findings and omission of conflicting data or willful suppression and/or distortion of data.
- **Plagiarism:** The appropriation of the language, ideas, or thoughts of another without crediting their true source and representation of them as one's own original work.
- **Improprieties of authorship:** Improper assignment of credit, such as excluding others, misrepresentation of the same material as original in more than one publication, inclusion of individuals as authors who have not made a definite contribution to the work published, or submission of multi-authored publications without the concurrence of all authors.
- **Misappropriation of the ideas of others:** an important aspect of scholarly activity is the exchange of ideas among colleagues. Scholars can acquire novel ideas from others during the process of reviewing grant applications and manuscripts. However, improper use of such

information can constitute fraud. Wholesale appropriation of such material constitutes misconduct.

- **Violation of generally accepted research practices:** Serious deviation from accepted practices in proposing or carrying out research, improper manipulation of experiments to obtain biased results, deceptive statistical or analytical manipulations, or improper reporting of results.
- **Material failure to comply with legislative and regulatory requirements affecting research:** Including but not limited to serious or substantial, repeated, willful violations of applicable local regulations and law involving the use of funds, care of animals, human subjects, investigational drugs, recombinant products, new devices, or radioactive, biologic, or chemical materials.
- **Inappropriate behavior in relation to misconduct:** This includes unfounded or knowingly false accusations of misconduct, failure to report known or suspected misconduct, withholding or destruction of information relevant to a claim of misconduct, and retaliation against persons involved in the allegation or investigation.

Deliberate misrepresentation of qualifications, experience, or research accomplishments to advance the research program, to obtain external funding, or for other professional advancement.

Responses to possible misconduct

Journals should have an explicit policy describing the process by which they will respond to allegations of misconduct. In drafting such a policy, the guidance provided to editors by a publication of the US Office of Research Integrity may be useful (ori.dhhs.gov/multimedia/acrobat/masm.pdf, accessed 12/2/03). The process described in the following two paragraphs is an example of a policy for an individual journal:

All allegations of misconduct will be referred to the Editor-In-Chief, who will review the circumstances in consultation with the deputy editors. Initial fact-finding will usually include a request to all the involved parties to state their case, and explain the circumstances, in writing. In questions of research misconduct centering on methods or technical issues, the Editor-In-Chief may confidentially consult experts who are blinded to the identity of the individuals, or if the allegation is against an editor, an outside editor expert. The Editor-In-Chief and deputy editors will arrive at a conclusion as to whether there is enough evidence to lead a reasonable person to believe there is a possibility of misconduct. Their goal is not to determine if actual misconduct occurred, or the precise details of that misconduct.

When allegations concern authors, the peer review and publication process for the manuscript in question will be halted while the process above is carried out. The investigation described above will be completed even if the authors withdraw their paper, and the responses below will still be considered. In the case of allegations against reviewers or editors, they will be replaced in the review process while the matter is investigated.

All such allegations should be kept confidential; the number of inquiries and those involved should be kept to the minimum necessary to achieve this end. Whenever possible, references to the case in writing should be kept anonymous.

Journals have an obligation to readers and patients to ensure that their published research is both accurate and adheres to the highest ethical standard. Therefore, if the inquiry concludes there is a reasonable possibility of misconduct, responses should be undertaken and chosen in accordance with the apparent magnitude of the misconduct. Responses may be applied separately or combined, and their implementation should depend on the circumstances of the case as well as the responses of the participating parties and institutions. The following options are ranked in approximate order of severity:

- A letter of explanation (and education) sent only to the person against whom the complaint is made, where there appears to be a genuine and innocent misunderstanding of principles or procedure.
- A letter of reprimand to the same party, warning of the consequences of future such instances, where the misunderstanding appears to be not entirely innocent.
- A formal letter referring the concerns to the relevant head of educational institution and/or funding body, with all the commentary and evidence collected by the journal. This will occur when it is believed that genuine misconduct is likely to have occurred, and its goal will be to submit the case for consideration of formal review and judgment by organizations better suited to that task than a peer review journal.
- A formal letter as above, including a written request to the supervising institution that an investigation be carried out and the findings of that inquiry reported in writing to the journal.
- Publication of a notice of redundant or duplicate publication or plagiarism, if appropriate (and unequivocally documented). Such publication will not require approval of authors and should be reported to their institution.
- Formal withdrawal or retraction of the paper from the scientific literature, published in the journal, informing readers and the indexing authorities (e.g., National Library of Medicine), if there is a formal

finding of misconduct by an institution. Such publication will not require approval of authors, should be reported to their institution, and should be readily visible and identifiable in the journal. It should also meet other requirements established by the International Committee of Journal Editors (www.icmje.org/#correct, accessed 12/2/03). It is recommended that editors inform readers and authors of their reservation of the right to publish a retraction if it meets these conditions, thereby helping decrease arguments with authors.

Editors or reviewers who are found to have engaged in scientific misconduct should be removed from further association with the journal, and this fact reported to their institution.

- d. Some other misdeeds that editors of nursing journals may encounter
 1. Advertising masking as authoring (ghostwriting by commercial vendors)
 - ◆ Editors need to be vigilant in monitoring and rejecting papers they know or suspect are written by vendor or staff or contracted parties promoting a particular product or service. Some red flags that signal papers of this nature include cover letters signed by staff from a public relations firm or vendor sales staff, nurse “authors” whose affiliation is the vendor rather than a healthcare facility or service, highly selective literature reviews that include only favorable findings related to a specific product or service, limited or no discussion of the product’s disadvantages, detrimental effects, or comparative features to competitors, and copy that conveys an advertising rather than scientific quality.
 - ◆ World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) Policy Statement on Ghost Writing Initiated by Commercial Companies (<http://www.wame.org/resources/policies>) relates that “The integrity of the published record of scientific research depends not only on the validity of the science but also on honesty in authorship. Editors and readers need to be confident that authors have undertaken the work described and have ensured that the manuscript accurately reflects their work The scientific record is distorted if the primary purpose of an article is to persuade readers in favor of a special interest, rather than to inform and educate, and this purpose is concealed.

Ghost authorship exists when someone has made substantial contributions to writing a manuscript and this role is not mentioned in the manuscript itself. WAME considers ghost authorship dishonest and unacceptable. Ghost authors generally work on behalf of companies, or agents acting for those

companies, with a commercial interest in the topic, and this compounds the problem. For example, a writer employed by a commercial company may prepare an article and then invite an expert in the field to submit the work, perhaps with minor revisions, under his or her own name. The submitting author may be paid, directly or indirectly, for this service. ... Although editors seek to avoid publication of ghost written articles, these articles are often very difficult to detect. ... Other parties, including companies—such as marketing, communications, and medical education companies who are paid to assist pharmaceutical and medical device companies in disseminating favorable messages about their products—may initiate the sequence of events for which the author is the final and most easily identified participant.

When editors detect ghost written manuscripts, their actions should involve both the submitting authors and commercial participants if they are involved. Several actions are possible:

Publish a notice that a manuscript has been ghost written, along with the names of the responsible companies and the submitting author;

Alert the authors' academic institutions, identifying the commercial companies;

Provide specific names if contacted by the popular media or government organizations; and

Share their experiences on the WAME Listserv and within other forums.

Together, these actions would increase transparency and public accountability about ghost writing and its manipulation of the scientific record and deter others from this practice.”

2. Conflicts of interest

- ◆ World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) Policy Statement on Journals' Role in Managing Conflict of Interest Related to the Funding of Research (<http://www.wame.org/resources/policies>) relates that

“Organizations that pay for research may have a vested interest in the results. Industry has a legitimate interest in the profitability of its products, which can be affected by the results of published

research. Other funders, such as governments and foundations, have political and economic points of view that they may want to see reflected in the research results.

If members of the funding organizations are direct participants in the research or control completion of the work and preparation and dissemination of results, they are in a position to bias the results, whether or not they mean to do so. The scientific record can also be biased if the funding organization can stop research before its planned completion or prevent publication of results.

Journal editors and authors have a responsibility to protect the integrity of the research record from bias related to the funding of research. This is best accomplished by revealing to readers the sponsorship of the research, any roles the sponsor played in the research, the institutional affiliations of the researchers and any relevant financial ties the researchers might have.

Editors should meet this responsibility by the following policies:

1. Authors should describe the sources of financial support for the research and this information should be published with the manuscript.
2. Editors should include in the body of the manuscript (usually in the methods section) a description of the sponsor's role in the research - for example, in formulation of the research question, choice of research design, data collection and analyses, preparation of reports, and the decision to publish.
3. Editors should publish with articles a description of each author's contributions to the research - for example, formulation of the research question, choice of research design, data collection and analyses, and preparation of reports.
4. Each author should state in writing whether or not he or she has a financial relationship with an organization that might have a vested interest in the conduct and reporting of the study. This information should be shared with reviewers and published with each article.
5. Editors should publish with articles a description of the institutional affiliations of each author, including all affiliations with organizations that might have a vested interest in the results of the research.

6. Authors should be asked to affirm in writing that they have not entered into an agreement with the funding organization that limited their ability to complete the research as planned and to publish the results.

7. Authors should state in writing that they have had full control of all primary data.

8. Authors' should agree in writing to allow the journal to review their data if requested.

- ◆ The *Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication* (accessed April 22, 2008, at <http://www.icmje.org/icmje.pdf>) relates the following:

Public trust in the peer review process and the credibility of published articles depend in part on how well conflict of interest is handled during writing, peer review, and editorial decision making. Conflict of interest exists when an author (or the author's institution), reviewer, or editor has financial or personal relationships that inappropriately influence (bias) his or her actions (such relationships are also known as dual commitments, competing interests, or competing loyalties). These relationships vary from those with negligible potential to those with great potential to influence judgment, and not all relationships represent true conflict of interest. The potential for conflict of interest can exist whether or not an individual believes that the relationship affects his or her scientific judgment. Financial relationships (such as employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony) are the most easily identifiable conflicts of interest and the most likely to undermine the credibility of the journal, the authors, and of science itself. However, conflicts can occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships, academic competition, and intellectual passion.

All participants in the peer review and publication process must disclose all relationships that could be viewed as presenting a potential conflict of interest. Disclosure of these relationships is also important in connection with editorials and review articles, because it is can be more difficult to detect bias in these types of publications than in reports of original research. Editors may use information disclosed in conflict of interest and financial interest

statements as a basis for editorial decisions. Editors should publish this information if they believe it is important in judging the manuscript.

Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Individual Authors' Commitments

When authors submit a manuscript, whether an article or a letter, they are responsible for disclosing all financial and personal relationships that might bias their work. To prevent ambiguity, authors must state explicitly whether potential conflicts do or do not exist. Authors should do so in the manuscript on a conflict of interest notification page that follows the title page, providing additional detail, if necessary, in a cover letter that accompanies the manuscript. (See Section IV.A.3. Conflict of Interest Notification Page)

Authors should identify individuals who provide writing or other assistance and disclose the funding source for this assistance. Investigators must disclose potential conflicts to study participants and should state in the manuscript whether they have done so. Editors also need to decide when to publish information disclosed by authors about potential conflicts. If doubt exists, it is best to err on the side of publication.

See also specific mention of **Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Project Support** and **Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Commitments of Editors, Journal Staff, or Reviewers**.

3. Duplicate submission

- ◆ The *Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication* (accessed April 22, 2008, at <http://www.icmje.org/icmje.pdf>) relates the following:

Most biomedical journals will not consider manuscripts that are simultaneously being considered by other journals. Among the principal considerations that have led to this policy are 1) the potential for disagreement when two (or more) journals claim the right to publish a manuscript that has been submitted simultaneously to more than one; and 2) the possibility that two or more journals will unknowingly and unnecessarily undertake the work of peer review and editing of the same manuscript and publish same article. However, editors of different journals may

decide to simultaneously or jointly publish an article if they believe that doing so would be in the best interest of the public's health.

4. Duplicate publication

- ◆ The *Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication* (accessed April 22, 2008, at <http://www.icmje.org/icmje.pdf>) relates the following:

Redundant (or duplicate) publication is publication of a paper that overlaps substantially with one already published in print or electronic media. Readers of primary source periodicals, whether print or electronic, deserve to be able to trust that what they are reading is original unless there is a clear statement that the article is being republished by the choice of the author and editor. The bases of this position are international copyright laws, ethical conduct, and cost-effective use of resources. Duplicate publication of original research is particularly problematic, since it can result in inadvertent double counting or inappropriate weighting of the results of a single study, which distorts the available evidence. Most journals do not wish to receive papers on work that has already been reported in large part in a published article or is contained in another paper that has been submitted or accepted for publication elsewhere, in print or in electronic media. This policy does not preclude the journal considering a paper that has been rejected by another journal, or a complete report that follows publication of a preliminary report, such as an abstract or poster displayed at a professional meeting. Nor does it prevent journals considering a paper that has been presented at a scientific meeting but not published in full or that is being considered for publication in a proceedings or similar format. Press reports of scheduled meetings will not usually be regarded as breaches of this rule, but additional data or copies of tables and illustrations should not amplify such reports. The ICMJE does not consider results posted in clinical trials registries as previous publications if the results are presented in the form of a brief structured abstract or table. The results registry should either cite the full publication or include a statement that indicates that the report has not been published in a peer reviewed journal.

When submitting a paper, the author must always make a full statement to the editor about all submissions and previous reports (including meeting presentations and posting of results in

registries) that might be regarded as redundant or duplicate publication of the same or very similar work. The author must alert the editor if the manuscript includes subjects about which the authors have published a previous report or have submitted a related report to another publication. Any such report must be referred to and referenced in the new paper. Copies of such material should be included with the submitted paper to help the editor decide how to handle the matter. If redundant or duplicate publication is attempted or occurs without such notification, authors should expect editorial action to be taken. At the least, prompt rejection of the submitted manuscript should be expected. If the editor was not aware of the violations and the article has already been published, then a notice of redundant or duplicate publication will probably be published with or without the author's explanation or approval. Preliminary reporting to public media, governmental agencies, or manufacturers, of scientific information described in a paper or a letter to the editor that has been accepted but not yet published violates the policies of many journals. Such reporting may be warranted when the paper or letter describes major therapeutic advances or public health hazards such as serious adverse effects of drugs, vaccines, other biological products, or medicinal devices, or reportable diseases. This reporting should not jeopardize publication, but should be discussed with and agreed upon by the editor in advance.

5. Plagiarism

- ◆ WAME's Publication Ethics Policies for Medical Journals include the following **Recommendations on Publication Ethics Policies for Medical Journals** (accessed on April 22, 2008, at <http://www.wame.org/resources/publication-ethics-policies-for-medical-journals>) related to Plagiarism:

Plagiarism is the use of others' published and unpublished ideas or words (or other intellectual property) without attribution or permission and presenting them as new and original rather than derived from an existing source. The intent and effect of plagiarism is to mislead the reader as to the contributions of the plagiarizer. This applies whether the ideas or words are taken from abstracts, research grant applications, Institutional Review Board applications, or unpublished or published manuscripts in any publication format (print or electronic).

Plagiarism is scientific misconduct and should be addressed as such (see prior section).

Self-plagiarism refers to the practice of an author using portions of their previous writings on the same topic in another of their publications, without specifically citing it formally in quotes. This practice is widespread and sometimes unintentional, as there are only so many ways to say the same thing on many occasions, particularly when writing the Methods section of an article. Although this usually violates the copyright that has been assigned to the publisher, there is no consensus as to whether this is a form of scientific misconduct, or how many of one's own words one can use before it is truly "plagiarism." Probably for this reason self-plagiarism is not regarded in the same light as plagiarism of the ideas and words of other individuals. If journals have developed a policy on this matter, it should be clearly stated for authors.

5. Evaluating the Journal **[provided by Cheryl Smart]**

- a. Financial evaluation:
 - 1. Journal revenue is generated from a number of sources, the most traditional of which include
 - ◆ Subscriptions (among them, individual, institution, bulk, membership, group, international and domestic, and free or "controlled")
 - ◆ Advertising/Sponsorships (print and online)
 - ◆ Author charges (e.g., page charges, submission fees, color)
 - ◆ Supplements
 - ◆ Licensing/permissions/translations (intellectual property income)
 - ◆ Reprints
 - ◆ Author page charges and/or color charges
 - 2. Journal expenses are generated from direct and indirect categories, including
 - ◆ Printing and binding
 - ◆ Electronic composition
 - ◆ Paper
 - ◆ Postage and wrappers
 - ◆ Electronic publication costs
 - ◆ Reprints
 - ◆ Subscription services (subscriber management)
 - ◆ Editorial office expenses
 - ◆ Editorial honoraria/stipends
 - ◆ Promotional/marketing costs
 - ◆ Advertising commissions or sales expense
 - ◆ Copyediting
 - ◆ Production and proofreading

- ◆ Administrative/management overhead *direct and indirect expenses
- ◆ Corporate or society overhead
- ◆ Royalties/profit

A direct expense is considered a measurable cost directly attributable to the journal (for example, paper, mailing, or honoraria); an indirect expense may be an allocated cost to the journal (for example, a percentage of a publisher's time, or a percentage of overhead for the publisher's departments such as finance, warehousing, reprint, advertising, editing, production). Direct and indirect costs may vary dependent on definition from publisher to publisher.

3. Journal profitability

- ◆ Is considered the measurement for long-term viability (versus simply total revenue generated). Profitability is defined as earned revenues minus the cost of total direct expenses, cost of sales, cost of indirect allocations and overhead and applicable taxes. It is generally expressed as a percentage of total revenue. While profit margin and revenue vary according to product types and an "acceptable" level of profit varies greatly from publisher to publisher, even a "not for profit" society generally needs at the least a budget neutral financial position in order for a journal to be continued.
- ◆ Profitability is reviewed by publishers on an issue-by-issue basis against a budget that is generally prepared in the summer preceding a publishing year. At year-end, publishers will again review the total year's performance versus the next year's projected budget.
- ◆ Journals generally "earn" only on an issue-by-issue basis, even though subscribers, for example, may pay for a full subscription in advance) and against annual budget plans. Direct journal costs grow on an annual basis as postage, paper, printing, labor and electronic investment charges increase on an annual basis, thus driving the need for increased subscription rates and/or advertising support, and so on.
- ◆ Marketing must have a positive return ratio; in other words, generic marketing, or marketing to very narrow or only tangentially related specialties, may not yield enough return to pay for the effort; on the other hand, marketing to an overly broad market with only minimal relationship to a specialty may be even more costly and less profitable. Tracking marketing efforts is important for the publisher because the phrase "if we do not remember the past we are doomed to repeat it" is never more important than in establishing valid, profitable marketing goals.

4. Relationship to mission

- ◆ In addition to evaluating a journal for specific financial performance/contribution to the owner, a journal is also reviewed for its relationship to the overall mission of the owner (contribution to overall mission and strategic plan and position in the marketplace, for example, and the “internal fit”).
- ◆ Related to the mission is the number of manuscript submissions (there is a time/money cost of reviewing and accepting or rejecting a paper, as well as a measurement of interest based on total submissions).

b. Editorial evaluation:

1. In order to evaluate the health of a publication, the editor should be familiar with the following:

- ◆ Number of text pages published versus pages projected:
 - Does the journal publish its targeted number of pages?
 - What is the manuscript submission/rejection number?
 - Is there a backlog of papers (and if so, is it due to a wealth of good papers or low rejection rate)?
 - If there is a backlog, does it negatively affect publication time?
- ◆ Frequency of publication
Is the frequency appropriate (a) for the specialty (b) within the profit level (c) according to competition (d) for the manuscript level?
- ◆ Rejection rate – does the rejection rate indicate high quality papers? How does the rejection rate relate to total manuscript submissions?
- ◆ Rank in specialty and how has this changed over the past years?
- ◆ Indexing status
- ◆ Timeliness of scheduled publication
- ◆ Timeliness and variety of electronic offering(s) – including online only features, number of accesses to site, various licensing arrangements and availability, etc.
- ◆ Contributors (e.g., geographic, professional status, centers of excellence)
- ◆ Mission/editorial cohesiveness – particularly is the mission too broad for specific specialties? Is the content appropriate for current readership and potential market?
- ◆ Design and format
 - ◆ Number and breakdown of subscribers and trends
 - ◆ Renewal rates

- ◆ Subscription prices versus market
 - ◆ Journal marketing efforts and success rates
 - ◆ Meetings
 - ◆ Market research
 - ◆ Competition
2. In order to appropriately review a publication, clarity must be defined through
- ◆ Editorial Mission Statement and supporting documentation including (a) who is the audience and what is the compelling market need for the product? (b) What are the product's specific editorial goals? (c) What unique product features contribute to the journal's success? and (d) Do other existing publications have similar mission(s) and what is their perceived success?
 - ◆ Publishing Plan: How is the mission statement achieved through the product in terms of circulation, pages, advertising, departments, and so on? Is there a written process and procedure? What "failsafe" plans exist to continue to publish the journal in case of disaster (personal or national)?
 - ◆ Editorial credentials: What is the visibility and professional status of the editor and editorial board? The reviewers? What are their contributions to the overall field? What is the strength of the author pool?
 - ◆ Print/online effectiveness: What measurements have been effected regarding readership of various formats of the journal? How does this align with the marketplace? What specific features are critical to the editorial success versus features that are non-critical? What "culling" mechanism exists? Does the editorial board review the journal on an issue-by-issue basis and if so, by what means do they provide their input? Can the editor and editorial board identify the strengths and weaknesses of the publication? Who are key subscribers and how are they "reached" by the journal.

6. Glossary of Terms

[provided by Cheryl Smart]

GLOSSARY –

This glossary of words and abbreviations commonly used in journal publishing was developed as a resource for the new editor. It is a compilation of published and anecdotal definitions; thus, some differences in word usage may vary by publisher.

| Term | Definition / Explanation |
|--------------------|---|
| Abstract | A very condensed summary of an article, abstracts may be structured or descriptive depending on the nature of the journal and/or the article. Structured abstracts generally include a form of objectives, methods, results and conclusions; descriptive abstracts may simply be narrative summaries or key points of an article. |
| Acknowledgments | A listing, often at the end of an article, of appreciation for specific contributions to an article or work by other than authors. |
| AMA Style | The style specified by the American Medical Association Manual of Style |
| Ascender/Descender | The portion of a letter that drops below the baseline (generally referring to the “drop” portions of p, g, j, y, f, q) |
| Advance | An amount paid to an editor (or author) in anticipation of honorarium or royalty |
| Advertising | Pages sold (paid advertising) or “free” (complimentary advertising) in a publication. Advertising is generally described as display or classified, display being quantities of pages including illustrations or images and billed on a percent of page basis; classified being “line” advertising, and usually billed on per word basis. Advertising is usually a passive and explanatory form of marketing, as opposed to direct response, which requests action on the part of a reader. Advertising can be |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| | combined with direct response in a journal through the use of a “bind-in” card. |
| Alignment | May also be known as “justification” and refers to how type, text or graphics are lined up at the top, bottom, sides or middle of a page. Common terms include “flush left”, “flush right”, “centered” and “fully justified.” Unaligned left or right side text may be referred to as “ragged.” |
| APA Style | The style specified by the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 5 th edition |
| Appendix | Supplementary material printed at the end of an article or text |
| Artwork | Artwork may refer to any non-text material included in an article. |
| Audience | the group most likely to be interested in reading information from a certain field or topic; can be known as “primary market” if they are likely to purchase as well as read |
| Author’s alterations (AAs) | Changes in copy or artwork after it has been typeset and sent to the printer, frowned upon by publishers because it can be costly for a print publication |
| Back Matter | Material published after editorial at the end of a journal; may include an index to advertisers, advertising, filler ads, or other non-indexed information |
| Bad break | An unattractive or illogical beginning or end to a page, line of type, or poorly hyphenated word (for example ending a page with a one-word line, or carry one word over to another page, etc.) |
| Binding | Process by which a journal is held together by fastening groups of assembled sheets (called signatures) along one edge of a publication. Journals are generally saddle stitched or perfect bound. |
| Bitmapped image | A graphic image stored as an arrangement of dots or pixels. Common types of bitmap graphics are GIF, JPEG, Photoshop, PCX, TIFF, etc., files. |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Bleed | “to bleed off the page” describes an illustration or image which extends beyond the trimmed page |
| BRC | Business Reply Card ... a card which is used to create an active marketing option (for example, a subscription card) |
| Broadside | A large (tabloid-sized) advertising flyer included in a publication. |
| Bullet | A small graphic (a circle, square, or other indicator) used in front of items in a list to highlight points made. |
| Byline | Author or authors name(s) as it appears under the title or at the end of an article. |
| Callout | Short text box that explains or amplifies a portion of an illustration, or reiterates a key statement, often set in a bold or different typeface |
| Caption | Explanatory text that accompanies illustrations or images |
| Circulation | The number of copies of a periodical that are distributed (primarily to “readers” versus multiple copies delivered to an address for undesignated readers (bulk copies.) Circulation for a journal is classified as “paid” or “controlled” (free). |
| Color separations | Preparing artwork, photographs, transparencies, or computer generated art for printing by separating into the four primary printing colors |
| Composition | The process of defining (“setting”) type and arranging elements on a page of text, generally done according to a defined “style.” |
| Content edit | An overall evaluation of a manuscript for content (versus editing for grammar and style, as in copy editing) style, continuity and sense. |
| Contract | Agreement drawn up (for example, between the publisher and the editor) to confirm responsibilities, payment terms, term of service, etc |
| Contrast | The value/difference between the darkest and lightest |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| | parts of an image |
| Cookies | A small piece of text information which an HTTP server can send to a browser which can be looked up and used when subsequent requests are made; the use of cookies is to preserve information for the user |
| Copy | All furnished material used for the production of a print or electronic product. In advertising, the written words of an advertisement are called “copy.” |
| Copy editor | Sometimes called “production editor”, representing the person employed by a publisher to work on the details of a journal in regard to accuracy in style and spelling, and prepares it for publication (versus an “author’s editor”, who generally is hired by an author to assist in rewriting articles). The copy editor usually works in the “journal editorial” department. |
| Copyright | The right to retain, reproduce, publish, sell or contract with others to sell the rights to an article or publication (or other work), usually held by the creator from the time of creation of a work until transferred. |
| Copyright infringement | When someone other than the copyright owner reproduces a copyrighted work (part or all of it) without the permission of the owner. |
| Crop | To “cut down” (eliminate) certain portions of a photograph, illustration or graphic in order to focus on only part of the illustration |
| Digitize | To convert or translate text, data, or photographs into a digital format (a binary system which is understood by a computer versus an analog system) |
| Dingbat | An ornamental type character such as a bullet, star, or flower used to decorate a page |
| Direct mail | A type of marketing in which an offer or promotion is mailed to individuals in a market, generally with the expectation that they will respond by purchasing that which is being promoted |
| Disclaimers | Statements that are meant to limit scope or responsibility. Most journals include disclaimers regarding the |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| | information included within the journal in order to attempt to protect the journal, editor, publisher, etc., from litigation. |
| Display ad | An advertisement that includes graphics (versus a classified ad, which is based on text only); display ads are generally billed on parts of a page (1/4, 1/2, full page, 2 page, etc.) while classified are generally billed by words and/or lines |
| Double-blind review | A manuscript's author's name(s) are not shared with manuscript reviewer(s) and vice versa |
| Double-page spread | Two facing pages of a publication that are related (also known as a two-page spread); often used in advertising to describe a two-page ad on facing pages, sometimes with a continuous illustration |
| DPI | Dots per inch – a term describing the measurement of the resolution of an image (or how many dots fit into a linear inch). The higher the "DPI", the more detail can be shown in an image. |
| Dummy | Before final printing, a copy of the layout of a printed piece or journal showing position and finished size and often used for final checking |
| Editor | The person who is responsible for the final editorial content of a publication. |
| Editorial | An opinion article, often written by the editor. |
| Editorial assistant | A person who assists an editor (or other editorial staff) in the overall administration of the journal, with the level of responsibility varying depending on the type of publication. |
| E-journal | A journal which is published on the "web"; thus in electronic format, only. |
| EPS | Encapsulated PostScript. A high resolution method of storing images |
| Erratum | A correction of an error in an article, normally inserted in the table of contents of a journal, (in print or online) also called "Correction Notice"; important to be placed there |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| | so it can be picked up by appropriate indexing services, etc. |
| Figure | An illustration or diagram included in text |
| Filler | A short item used to fill space in a publication—sometimes news or “evergreen” information (that which does not age and can be used repeatedly) |
| Flush left/right | Type in a column or page that lines up with the left margin is “flush left” or “left side justified”; the right margin is “flush right” or “right side justified” |
| Folio | The page number which is printed at the top or bottom of each printed page; also may represent a grouping of printed pages |
| Font | A specific type face. Often font families are serif, sans-serif, and cursive. Journals generally contain a mixture of fonts, but all specific type elements are printed in the same font, making up part of the style and format. |
| Form (or printing form) | A group of pages, usually 8, 15, or 24, that are combined to be printed together; the number of pages in a form depends on the total number of pages in a journal. When 4-color is combined with black and white, the printer tries to group 4-color together in order to economize on printing costs, as 4-color is much more expensive than black and white. |
| Format | A journal defined by its height, depth, style (font and page layout) |
| Four-color process | The combination of 4 colors in printing (called CMYK for cyan, magenta, yellow and black) to create the effect of a large number of colors |
| FPO | “For Position Only” – using low resolution images to show placement (replaced by high res images at printing or final edit) |
| Frequency | How often a journal or magazine is published (for example, bi-monthly, quarterly, monthly) |
| Front Matter | The pages in the front of the journal that precede articles/editorial content, including the table of contents, editorial board page, instructions to authors, etc. |
| Galley Proof (or “galley” or | A term representing a now obsolete tray in which lines of |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| “galley stage”) | metal type were assembled during the time of hand typesetting), now used to represent a proof copy of lines of type prior to page make-up or, in electronic publishing, sometimes used to simply represent an article in early stages of editing at the publisher. |
| Ghost author. Ghost authorship | Someone who writes on behalf of another, but remains anonymous (is not cited as an author) |
| Glossy | A photograph printed on shiny paper (or, in publishing, a journal or magazine printed on high quality, shiny paper, referring to the shiny coating applied to the paper) |
| Gutter | The inner margins (white space) of two facing pages in a publication (where the pages join together) |
| Halftone | The reproduction of artwork into a series of tiny dots, which when printed look like the original representation of continuous lines (but when studied, one can identify the dots) |
| Headline (running head) | The line which commonly appears at the top of each printed page, typically showing the journal name on the left hand side and the section or article title on the right, sometimes including the page number (folio) |
| Imposition | The positioning of pages on a large sheet of paper at the printer, which when printed and folded produces the correct sequence of pages |
| Imprint | The name of the publisher under which a journal is issued, not always the “umbrella” organization. Imprints may be used to develop or maintain marketing recognition or to indicate historical presence in a field. |
| Indicia | Postal information (commercial “return address”) required for mailing a printed product. |
| ISBN | Abbreviation for International Standard Book Number – a unique identifier in book publishing that includes the binding, edition and publisher |
| ISSN | Abbreviation for International Standard Serials Number - another unique identifier in the journal and magazine publishing business |
| Layout | The master plan of the arrangement of the graphic |

| | |
|------------|---|
| | elements of a publication (or “to layout” is to put all the graphic elements together) |
| Leading | The space between two lines on a page, also called “line spacing.” |
| Leaf | A piece of paper which, front and back, includes two pages |
| Legend | A concise definition of the elements used in a chart or photograph, often displayed in small print beneath the chart or at the bottom of a page of text |
| License | A subsidiary right granted for a specific term or particular usage by the holder of the copyright of an article or journal |
| Margin | The white space surrounding a page of type |
| Market | The potential readership who will purchase a journal or the territories of the world into which a journal may be sold |
| Marketing | The department in a publishing house with responsibility for promoting (journals or other products); this may include conference displays, press releases, advertising (though this is often a separate department), public relations and publicity |
| Markup | “Markup” is the instructions to the printer from the publisher specifying the style rules. In electronic publishing, markup includes symbols that provide the same kind of instructions for a webpage by marking up content using HTML (Hypertext Markup Language). |
| Masthead | The section of a journal that lists the title of the publication, the editorial staff, the publisher, ownership, and other publication information as determined by the editor and publisher. |
| Matchprint | A brand name used commonly for a form of digital color proof, often used to determine if a printed image or illustration represents the original color correctly. |
| Net | A price which is not subject to further discount or the profit on journal revenues after costs and discounts are |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | reduced; often used to mean “final”; also used to indicate the Internet, or computer network consisting of a worldwide network of computer networks that use the TCP/IP network protocols to facilitate data transmission and exchange |
| Offprint | A copy of an individual article “overrun” at the time of printing, rather than reprinted at a later date, and may include ends or beginning of other articles depending on the signature size; publishers sometimes use this as a less expensive method of providing reprints |
| Page proof | A layout of pages as they will appear in a publication, often used for a final check. |
| Peer review | The process by which experts in a specific field are selected (by the editor or designee) to review (for potential acceptance, generally based on a pre-determined level of appropriateness) manuscripts which have been submitted to a publication for potential acceptance. After acceptance and publication, the final publication is then considered “peer reviewed” (sometimes called “refereed”). |
| Perfect bound | The method of binding a journal with glue to a spine, versus stapling pages together (“saddle-stitched”); used for journals or books with a greater number of pages |
| Permissions | Copyright law requires written permission of the copyright holder for reuse of material. |
| Point size | A typographical unit of measure relative to the size of a font. |
| Print run | The total number of copies of a publication to be run by the printer, generally determined by the publisher to accommodate the number of subscribers and appropriate inventory (also called a press run). |
| Proof | A reproduction of how a printed piece is expected to look, and can take many forms. “To proof” also means to check for color and position, or to proof read. |
| Proofreader | To proofread is to check, generally for spelling and punctuation errors. A proofreader does not generally check for style errors. |
| Publisher | The publisher may either be a firm dedicated to the business of publishing, or the person responsible for the |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| | overall process of producing and disseminating a publication to the public or a specific market or markets. |
| Rate card | A journal or magazine's published rates for advertising, shown by cost per page (or portion of page) size and frequency |
| Running head/foot | A word, phrase, headline or title that is repeated at the top (or bottom) of each page (or sometimes every other page). |
| Saddle-stitched | A journal that is bound together by stapling through the gutter fold, generally making it "spineless" as opposed to perfect bound, which is glued to a spine |
| Scale | To reduce or enlarge an image or a page proportionally; may also be a synonym for "size" |
| Sheet fed | In printing, a press that accepts and prints one sheet at a time |
| Sidebar | A distinct section of an article that may amplify the text (it should not simply contain the same information) that often uses different type to set it apart. |
| Solicited manuscripts | Also called "invited" manuscripts, these may be requested of a specific author or authors by an editor to meet editorial needs, or to address a particular topic. Solicited manuscripts may (or may not be) peer reviewed based on the journal or magazine's editorial policy. |
| Spine | The flat side of a journal or magazine which holds the front and back cover together, and to which pages are fastened to the binding. The "open" and opposite side is the trim edge. The spine usually carries the name of the journal and date of publication. |
| Spot Color | In a black and white printed page, an additional color of ink used to highlight an area is called a "spot color" |
| Stet | A proof mark meaning "keep as originally shown" |
| STM | "Scientific, technical, and medical" An abbreviation often used to designate the broad field of medical and scientific publishing |
| Structured abstract | An abstract structured to follow "the scientific method", and which summarizes the paper content under headings such as "Aim, Background, Method, Findings, and Conclusion" and limited to a certain number of words, for example, 250, and not including references or abbreviations |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| | |
| Table of contents | A listing or chart usually included in the early pages of a magazine or journal, identifying the contents (articles, sections, etc.) and page numbers, and abbreviated as “TOC” |
| Tables | A graphic element containing an arrangement of rows and columns containing specific data relevant to an article |
| Tear sheet | Some publishing companies literally pull printed advertising pages from a journal after publication and send them to the paid advertisers. These (or other “torn pages”) are referred to as “tear sheets.” In some cases may also be referred to as offprints |
| Tip in/tip on | To “tip in” means that a card or page is lightly glued within a journal by a small line of adhesive usually along the inside edge, making it easy to pull off. Often used for business reply cards. To “tip on” means to glue lightly a card or leaf to the cover |
| Trim size | The standard size of a journal or magazine after it has been printed and trimmed (ready to mail), for example “8 ½ x 11”) |
| Web | A roll of printing paper. Larger journals are printed often printed on a “web press” which allows multiple pages to be printed simultaneously (versus a press that prints on a page at a time, called “sheet fed”) |
| White space | White space is the space left unmarked (unprinted) on a page, including the gutters, margins, spacing between paragraphs, columns, or even characters, and generally considered the “balance”, or negative to the positive of type. It was termed white space because most journals were printed on white paper, and thus it is the amount of paper that shows. |

References

American Medical Association, (2007) *AMA Manual of Style, A guide for authors and Editors*, 10th Edition, Oxford University Press.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

The Associated Press Stylebook and Libel Manual. Reading, Mass: Perseus, 1998.

Bishop, C. T. (1984). *How to edit a scientific journal*. Philadelphia: ISI Press.

Council of Biology Editors, Inc. (1990). *Ethics and policy in scientific publication*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

Council of Biology Editors Style Manual Committee. *Scientific Style and Format: CBE Manual for Authors, Editors and Publishers*, 6th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1994.

Gibaldi, Joseph, ed. *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Modern Language Association, 1998.

Glossary of Publishing Terminology (online); The Publishers Association, UK, 1997. Available at <http://www.osi.hu/cpd/resources/paglossary.htm>. Accessed April, 2008.

Goodman, S.N., Berlin, J., Fletcher, S.W., & Fletcher, R.H. (1994). Manuscript quality before and after peer review and editing. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 121(1), 11-21. Cited Bailar JC III and Mosteller F. Guidelines for statistical reporting in articles for medical journals. Amplifications and explanations. *Ann Intern Med*. 1988; 108:266-73 as well as Pocock SJ, Hughes MD, Lee RJ. Statistical problems in the reporting of clinical trials. A survey of three medical journals. *N Engl J Med*. 1987; 317:426-32.

Grayson, L. (2002). *Evidence based policy and the quality of evidence: Rethinking peer review*. Working Paper 7. London, United Kingdom: ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, University of London.

- International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2007, October). *Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals: Writing and editing for biomedical publication*. Available at <http://www.icmje.org/index.html>
- Jefferson, T., Alderson, .P, Wager, E., & Davidoff, F. (2002). Effects of editorial peer review: A systematic review. *JAMA*, 287, 2784-2786.
- Jefferson, T., Wager, E., & Davidoff, F. (2000). Measuring the quality of editorial peer review. *JAMA*, 287, 2786-2790.
- Journal of Electronic Publishing, www.journalofelectronicpublishing.org
- O'Connor, M. (1986). *How to copyedit scientific books & journals*. Philadelphia: ISI Press.
- Plotnick, A. (1986). *Elements of editing*. Bel Air, CA: Longman Publishing Group.
- The Rainwater Press Publishing Primer: A glossary of terms for the electronic publishing, graphic arts, and printing industries* (online). Accessed April, 2008.
- Schwartz, M., & Task Force on Bias-Free Language of the Association of American University Presses. (1995). *Guidelines for bias-free writing*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Sylvia, L.M., & Herbel, J.L. (2001). Manuscript peer review—A guide for health care professionals. *Pharmacotherapy*, 21(4), 395-404.
- World Association of Medical Editors. A syllabus for prospective and newly appointed editors. Available at <http://www.wame.org/resources/editor-s-syllabus>
- World Association of Medical Editors. WAME publication ethics policies for medical journals. Available at <http://www.wame.org/resources/publication-ethics-policies-for-medical-journals#peer>
- World Association of Medical Editors. WAME policy statements. Available at <http://www.wame.org/resources/policies>

