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Two Journal Offices

• **The Americas**
  – Peter Strouse, Editor
  – Assistant Editors: Brian Coley, Cindy Rigsby, Geetika Khanna
  – Editorial Assistant: Pat Vario

• **Europe** (and the rest of the World)
  – Øystein Olsen, Interim Editor
  – Assistant Editor: Annie Paterson

• **Springer** = our publisher
  – Jay-Y Banua, JEO
Pediatric Radiology – The Review Process

1. Manuscript is assigned to a Review Process Editor by Editorial Office
2. Review Process Editor invites reviewers
3. Reviewers read paper, submit reviews
4. Editors read paper, read reviews
5. Editorial conference call → decision
6. For ‘revise’ and ‘accept’ → iThenticate (plagiarism detection)
7. Review Process Editor drafts decision letter to authors
8. Authors revise paper in accordance with decision letter
9. Review Process Editor reviews revised manuscript
   - may ask for additional revisions
   - may ask for additional review(s)
10. Review Process Editor makes final decision
Double Blind Review

Reviewers are blinded to author identity

Authors are blinded to reviewer identity
Types of Papers

- Original Article
- Review
- Pictorial Essay
- Case Report
- Technical Innovation
- Other: Point/counterpoint, Mini-symposia, Supplements, Research Forum, Commentaries, Editorials, Letters to the Editors & responses, other special rubrics
Number of Reviewers

- Original Article - 3
- Review - 3
- Pictorial Essay - 3
- Case Report - 2
- Technical Innovation - 3
Selection of Reviewers

- Expertise
  - Pediatric Radiologists
  - Clinical MDs
  - Other specialists
- Quality of previous reviews
- Frequency of reviews
- Balance
- +/- Statistician
- +/- Physicist
Most Original Articles are reviewed by 7 reviewers in total (some more).

3+ Reviewers
4 Editors
The Review

• Due in 2 weeks (14 days)
• Negotiable
The Review

• Recommendation – accept/revise/reject

• For the Editor
  • Confidential comments

• For the Author
  • Constructive comments
  • General and specific
  • Organized (i.e. section-by-section)
Reviewers’ Recommendations

• Chief guide to accept/revise/reject decision
• Frequently do not agree
• Are not binding
Reviewers’ Comments

• Cut and paste into Decision Letter
• May be edited
  – Numbered & organized
  – Some limited editing (i.e. spelling)
  – [Editorial comment: __________]
  – Some deleted
  – Disparaging/inflammatory comments removed
  – Conflicting comments removed or edited
    • vs. other reviewers
    • vs. journal author instructions
Decision Letter

• Decision
• Comments from Editor
  – Summation
  – Emphasis of key points for revision
  – Formatting issues
• Comments from Reviewers (edited)
• Directions for revision submission
Decisions

- Accept
- Major Revision
- Minor Revision
- Reject
- Reject (Option to Resubmit)
Revisions

• ‘Revise’ decision is not guarantee of eventual acceptance

• w/ revision, authors must adequately address all suggestions from editors and reviewers

• Review Process Editor will assess adequacy of revisions

• May send paper for re-review – old and/or new reviewers
Final Acceptance Rate*

• Original Articles - 44 %
• Review Articles - 46 %
• Case Reports - 19 %
