Guidelines for Academic Editors

Dear Medicine® Academic Editor,

Once again, I would like to extend our deepest appreciation for your willingness to support Medicine®.

Medicine® covers a broad range of specialties and subspecialties and depends on a review process that is both effective and timely, and the oversight of the Academic Editors is essential to this process.

Academic Editors are more than reviewers. Academic Editors are charged with:

- assessing a manuscript's overall appropriateness for Medicine®,
- determining if additional review is necessary,
- making an initial editorial recommendation, and
- making a final editorial decision.

In this guideline we will go into further depth about the tasks and expectations of an Academic Editor. One essential aspect of Medicine®’s editorial model is that a manuscript’s novelty, originality, or potential for impact are not a consideration for publication. Medicine®’s mission is to publish articles that are scientifically, technically, and ethically valid. For example, this may include negative results or manuscripts that replicate results of previous studies.

The Medicine® Editorial staff is a valuable resource to answer any questions that might arise during the review process. Please do not hesitate to contact them for assistance.

Medicine® Editorial Office (medicine@wolterskluwer.com)
Tom Pacific, Publisher (thomas.pacific@wolterskluwer.com)

Thank you very much for your participation in this exciting endeavor and your important contributions to come.

Sincerely,

Tom Pacific
Publisher, Open Access
Wolters Kluwer
Guidelines for Academic Editors

Overview
The goal of Medicine®’s review process is to establish an article’s technical, scientific and ethical validity. **Novelty and potential for impact are not to be considered when assessing a manuscript or providing an editorial recommendation.**

Academic Editors are entrusted with the initial assessment, supervision of additional peer review, and adjudication of submissions to Medicine®.

Academic Editors are asked to:
- be willing to handle manuscripts as an Academic Editor,
- assess a manuscript’s overall appropriateness for Medicine®,
- determine if additional review is necessary,
- make an initial editorial recommendation,
- make a final editorial decision,
- be prompt in response to invitations, and
- read and understand the guidelines for Academic Editors and ensure that the manuscripts adhere to the editorial standards as stated in the Medicine® Information for Authors

Getting Started

**Editorial Manager Classifications/ Submission Assignment**
When an Academic Editor completes their registration in the Editorial Manager submission and review web site ([http://www.editorialmanager.com/md](http://www.editorialmanager.com/md)), the system requires that personal classifications be selected to identify the Academic Editor’s areas of expertise.

Similarly, during the initial submission process, an author is asked to provide article classifications from the same classification list.

Following the initial technical check by the Editorial Office, Academic Editors with personal classifications that match the article classifications of the submission will be asked to claim the submission. The claim is made on a first come-first serve basis, and once claimed the manuscript will appear in the Academic Editors assignments folder, and Academic Editors who were invited but did not claim the submission will be advised of the assignment.

More information on classifications and submission assignment can be found in the Academic Editor Tutorial.

**Accepting or declining invitations**
If you are able to handle a manuscript as an Academic Editor, please select the assignment within **five (5) days.** If we do not receive a reply within that timeframe we may assign another editor.
If you receive an invitation and cannot accept the review please select ‘Decline to Review’ as soon as possible so we can select another reviewer for the manuscript.

Timing

We ask editors to invite a reviewer within ten (10) days after accepting the manuscript. Please notify the editorial office if you need more time or cannot complete the invitations.

Disclosures and Conflict of Interests

You should not accept a manuscript if there is a potential conflict of interest on a paper. This could include any of the following:

- Previous knowledge of the study
- Collaboration with the corresponding or secondary authors
- Potential to profit from the work financially

Review Process

Initial Assessment

Academic Editors are encouraged to perform an initial assessment to quickly determine the manuscript’s overall appropriateness for Medicine®. Submission content should fall within the scope of the journal, should be presented in accordance with the corresponding Reporting Guidelines, and be free of ethical violations.

As a reminder, novelty and potential for impact are not to be considered when assessing a manuscript or providing an editorial recommendation. Academic Editors are free to adjudicate a manuscript based on this initial assessment, if they feel that further review would not fundamentally change the editorial decision.

Criteria for Publication

Reviewers will be asked the following questions when submitting a review and we ask Academic Editors to keep these questions in mind as well when assessing a manuscript. For more information please see the Criteria for Acceptance document.

1) Is the manuscript technically sound, and the data support the conclusion?
2) Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?
3) Does the manuscript adhere to standards in this field for data availability?
4) Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

Additional Peer Review

Following initial assessment, Academic Editors are encouraged to seek out additional review from at least 2 individuals. Reviewers may be selected from the following:
1. Individuals registered as reviewers within the Editorial Manager database.
2. Non-registered individuals known to the Academic Editor.

Detailed instructions on the reviewer search and invitation process can be found by using Editorial Manager’s online “Help” or in the Editor Tutorial found here.

Reviewer Ratings

After a reviewer submits their completed review, Academic Editors are asked to supply a Reviewer Rating for each review. The Reviewer Ratings will be in place to help you make decisions on which reviewers to choose when soliciting feedback as well as hope to improve the comments and overall constructive assessment of the reviews given. The ratings will be on a 1-100 scale and will rely on you to determine the grading of the review.

Here are a few questions to help you judge the review:

- Did the reviewer submit his decision within the given timeframe allotted?
- Did the review help you reach your final decision on the paper?
- Does the review clearly state its points to the author and offer professional corrective suggestions that will make the paper better?
- If reviewer asks for revisions are they clear about what is essential and what is a suggestion?

A good review has two goals: the primary goal is to help the handling editor make a decision about the manuscript and the secondary goal is to help the author understand how to improve their work.

If a reviewer submits their review on time and provides constructive analysis that helps you make a decision on a manuscript, they have fulfilled their basic duties as a journal reviewer.

Continuing Education CME for Reviewers

When a peer review is completed and the review is available to you in Editorial Manager, you will continue to rate the review on a scale of 1 – 100. For reviewers seeking credit who have earned a score of 70 or above, the Wolters Kluwer CE Department will e-mail a CE certificate to the reviewer. In accordance with provider guidelines, physicians (MDs and DOs) will earn 3 AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™ credits.

If you score the review at less than 70, the editorial office will reach out the reviewer and inform them of the decision.

The criteria for earning a score of 70 or above is a judgment call on each individual academic editor.

For more information please see the CME for Reviewers FAQ.

Adjudication

An editorial decision may be made immediately following the initial assessment, or following the receipt of additional reviews. Once a decision has been entered, communications to the author will be managed
by the Medicine® editorial office. If a revision is requested, the revised submission will be automatically assigned to the original submission’s Academic Editor.

**Editorial Decision Terms**

1. Accept
2. Accept Pending Minor Revision
3. Revise
4. Reject

*Please note that an Accept decision indicates to the editorial office that a manuscript has been reviewed and ready for publication.

**Publication**

The Academic Editor will be identified on the title page of published articles, along with dates of submission, decision and publication.

**What to do if there is a concern about an author or paper?**

Knowing when to identify editorial misconduct can be difficult for a reviewer or editor. If during your review you have a concern about a paper or author, please inform the Editorial Office for further instruction at medicine@wolterskluwer.com. An expression of concern can help identify possible fraud or correct an honest mistake by the author.

Below are some examples that should be addressed with the Editorial Office.

- Authorship Issues
  - Corresponding author wants to add multiple authors after acceptance
- Redundant Publication and Plagiarism
- Fabrication/falsification of data
- Potential Conflict of Interest
  - Suspect the author did not disclose a possible financial interest

**Editorial Manager – Tutorial For Editors**

The Editor Tutorial found here provides detailed instructions on all Editor capabilities within Editorial Manager (Instructions can also be found in the “Help” section of the Editorial Manager web site). Academic Editors are granted limited capabilities. Below are listed the corresponding “Tutorial” page numbers for specific Academic Editor functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accessing Editorial Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Overview of the Editor Main Menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Editor ‘To Do’ List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Inviting and Assigning Reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommending a Colleague

Reviewers and Academic Editors for *Medicine*®

If you are interested in recommending a colleague to become a reviewer or Academic Editor for *Medicine*® please fill out the Recommend a Colleague form and submit it to the Editorial Office at medicine@wolterskluwer.com.

Support Staff

For any questions or assistance, please contact:

medicine@wolterskluwer.com