

Review process: Editor's suggestions for JMRI

Jeong Hee Yoon

Radiology, Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, Korea

Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (JMRI) is an official journal of International Society of Magnetic Resonance in Medicine (ISMRM). Professor Mark Schweitzer is a current editor-in-chief of JMRI, and we have 36 deputy editors consisting of MDs and PhDs across the continents. In this session, I would briefly introduce our review system and some personal suggestions regarding the manuscript which are about to be submitted for JMRI in near future.

Keywords : Journal review

Editors' suggestions for MRM

Seung-Kyun Lee

¹Biomedical Engineering, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea, ²Center for Neuroscience Imaging Research, IBS, Suwon, Korea

This talk is a continuation of last year's presentation on the review process of Magnetic Resonance in Medicine (MRM), which is one of the two official journals of the ISMRM. The journal publishes broadly in the field of clinical and preclinical MRI with emphasis on methodology. In the span of one year ending on September 30th, 2018, the journal received 1044 new submissions, a record high number. Its acceptance rate is at about 45%. In the past year, the journal's impact factor surpassed 4.0 for the first time, and a major initiative to cut down on the manuscript processing time was implemented. Currently the average time between on-line (Early View) and in-print publication (pagenation) stands at 3 months.

The journal has a standard, single-blind peer review process, where an editor passes a given manuscript on to multiple reviewers (typically 2) with author information visible, and the reviewers provide assessment of the manuscript's publication worthiness anonymously. The reviewers are asked to score the manuscript on four aspects: Originality, Soundness of conclusions, Importance, and Quality (of methods, data and presentation). In general, the journal allows no more than two chances for major revision. Therefore, when the authors receive the initial decision letter with major revision recommendation, the response to the review comments in the subsequent revision is important and should show clear progress towards reviewer satisfaction, typically evidenced by substantially improved manuscript scores. In rare cases, the manuscript can be rejected by the editors without being sent to the reviewers on the grounds that the topic of the paper is outside the scope of the journal.

The journal competes with many new and traditional medical imaging journals to publish high quality papers. Knowing what the journal looks for from the submitted manuscripts could help prospective authors better prepare their submissions to avoid wasted efforts and unnecessary delays in their research publication.

As in the last year, this presentation is for graduate students, postdocs, and principal investigators who want to know more about the following questions: (1) what happens after my MRM submission until a decision letter is sent out? (2) What is the acceptance rate and what are the common reasons for rejection? (3) What does the journal look for from the authors?

Keywords : MRM, Peer review

Editors' suggestions for KJR

Ho Sung Kim

Radiology, Asan Medical Center, Seoul, Korea

1. KJR Manuscript Review Workflow

- 1) Initial submission: Admin – Section Editor – Peer reviewers – Editor-in Chief
-> Accept, Minor revision, Major revision, Reject: Resubmission allowed, Reject: No further consideration
- 2) Reject: Resubmission allowed vs. Major revision vs Minor revision
 - Reject: Resubmission allowed: the initial reviewers + new reviewer or new reviewers
 - Major revision: Do not use new reviewers--review within the initial reviewers.
 - Minor revision: Do not use new reviewers--review within the past reviewers. Strongly recommend making decision by Section Editor without peer review
- 3) Split decision between peer reviewers
 - Do not leave the direction of the manuscript to the peer reviewers
 - The Section Editor determines the further direction of the manuscript by identifying whether the reviewer's comment is improper or biased.

2. Section Editor's Procedures

- 1) Editorial reject: All in-house rejects should be made in A FEW DAYS after a manuscript is assigned to Section Editor. Delayed in-house rejects would require Section Editor's comments to authors.
- 2) Select peer reviewers:
 - At least 2 reviewers for initial submission
 - Avoid assigning more than 1 manuscripts simultaneously to a reviewer. Otherwise, they are most likely to decline to review.
 - Strongly encourage to use expert international guest reviewers
- 3) Decision suggestion
 - Related tasks: decision suggestion, comments to the Editor-in Chief, comments to the authors, and evaluation of reviewer quality
 - Leave a comment to Editor-in Chief regarding which reviewer comments are biased and could be ignored or deleted.
 - Revised manuscripts: the number of revisions does not exceed two (R3 does not occur). Section Editor needs to make efforts to reduce unnecessary peer review and make quick review.
- 4) Reasons in case of an editorial rejection without peer review
 - Subject matter outside of the main interests of our journal and readers
 - Organization of manuscript that does not follow our Instructions for Authors
 - Overlap with prior publications, i.e. potential plagiarism or duplicate publication
 - Limited incremental new information
 - Insufficient methodology or description of methodology
 - Small sample size
 - Unclear use of English language which hinders our ability to understand the manuscript
- 5) Reviewers' rating
 - Reader interest
 - Scientific quality or educational and pictorial quality (depending on article types)
 - Originality, Importance
 - Clarity of organization, writing, and language
 - Overall

3. Editor's Decision from an Expert's Point of View, especially in split decision between peer reviewers
(modified from "what do *Nature* editors look for?")

1) Recommended, General:

- **Novel** conclusions of interest that change our understanding of the medical knowledge
- **Scientific** support for conclusions
- Work that can lead to **further research**

2) Recommended, Certain Types (e.g. technical papers, guideline, meta-analysis...)

- Significant resource value

- **Technical breakthrough**

3) Depending on Peer Reviewers' Comments

- Findings that are entirely in line with hypothesis of the paper
- Methods of use only to specialists
- Replications that do not move the field forward

4) Reporting Guideline (STARD, TRIPOD...)

Keywords : Review, Editor, Radiology, Novel, Scientific

Editors' suggestion for Scientific Report

Yongmin Chang

¹Department of Radiology, Kyungpook National University Hospital, Daegu, Korea, ²Department of Molecular Medicine, School of Medicine, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

Scientific Reports is an online, open access journal from the publishers of *Nature*. The journal, which is indexed in ISI Web of Science, PubMed, PubMed Central, Scopus, Google Scholar, publishes scientifically valid primary research from all areas of the sciences including biomedical engineering and radiology. One of the unique aims of *Scientific Reports* is that if the research is scientifically valid and technically sound then it deserves to be published and made accessible to the research community. With this unique publication policy, the primary acceptance criterion is whether a paper is scientifically and technically valid, rather than high significance or high novelty. Therefore, with high importance of scientific and technical soundness, *Scientific Reports* do not accept the preliminary study, case report and technical note.

Each manuscript submitted to *Scientific Reports* is handled by an Editorial Board Member, and most submissions are peer reviewed by one or more referees in addition to the Editorial Board Member. The handling editorial board member can also reject the submission without peer review at the editor's own internal review process. In case of peer review, The Editorial Board manages the peer review process, and decides whether a paper should be accepted for publication. The aim of the peer review process is to establish the scientific and technical soundness of a submission. Referees and Editorial Board Members will determine whether a paper is scientifically valid, rather than making judgements on significance or whether the submission represents a conceptual advance. *Scientific Reports* try to make first decisions on manuscripts within 45 days. After acceptance, papers are immediately processed, and published on a daily basis.

Keywords : Editor, Scientific Reports, Peer review