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Why?

- Trusted and helpful information for veterinary radiologists and radiation oncologists worldwide.
- Global face of the ACVR
- Building blocks for future research
56 years!
What resources are available for peer reviewers?

Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

WAME has collaborated with the Committee on Publication Ethics, the Directory of Open Access Journals, and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association to develop the following Principles. The Principles are available on the Web sites of all the participating organizations.

Date of Publication: June 22, 2015

Introduction

The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA), and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) are scholarly organizations that have seen an increase in the number, and broad range in the quality, of membership applications. Our organizations have collaborated in an effort to identify principles of transparency and best practice for scholarly publications and to clarify that these principles form part of the criteria on which membership applications will be evaluated.

These criteria are largely derived from those developed by the Directory of Open Access Journals. Note that additional membership criteria may also be used by each of the scholarly organizations. The organizations will not share information about applications received. We do not intend to develop or
Responsibilities in the Submission and Peer-Review Process
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1. Authors

Authors should abide by all principles of authorship and declaration of conflicts of interest detailed in section IIA and B of this document.

2. Journals

a. Confidentiality

Manuscripts submitted to journals are privileged communications that are authors’ private, confidential property, and authors may be harmed by premature disclosure of any or all of a manuscript’s details. Editors therefore must not share information about manuscripts, including whether they have been received and are currently under review.
Promoting integrity in research publication

COPE is a forum for editors and publishers of peer reviewed journals to discuss all aspects of publication ethics. It also advises editors on how to handle cases of research and publication misconduct. Read more about COPE...
Provenzale and Stanley
854 AJR:185, October 2005
APPENDIX 1: A Systematic Guide to Reviewing a Manuscript
Before Writing the Review
• To which manuscript category does this manuscript best conform?
• Are there any potential biases in reviewing this manuscript?
• Does the manuscript address an important problem?
• Has the manuscript been previously published?

Overview

Aims and Scope

Veterinary Radiology & Ultrasound is a bimonthly, international, peer-reviewed, research journal devoted to the fields of veterinary diagnostic imaging and radiation oncology. Established in 1958, it is the official journal of the American College of Veterinary Radiology, European College of Veterinary Diagnostic Imaging, European Association of Veterinary Diagnostic Imaging, International Veterinary Radiology Association, and the Australasian Association of Veterinary Diagnostic Imaging. Veterinary Radiology & Ultrasound is also represented on the Committee on Publication Ethics.

The mission of Veterinary Radiology & Ultrasound is to serve as a leading resource for high quality articles that advance scientific knowledge and standards of clinical practice in the areas of veterinary diagnostic radiology, computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, ultrasonography, nuclear imaging, radiation oncology, and interventional radiology. Manuscript types include original investigations, imaging diagnosis reports, review articles, editorials and letters to the Editor. Acceptance criteria include originality, significance, quality, reader interest, composition and adherence to author guidelines.

The time from submission to first decision averages 26 days. Currently papers are published online with a DOI and Pubmed ID on Wiley-Blackwell’s “EarlyView” within 60 working days from the date of final edit.

Abstracting and Indexing Information
What’s the process for first submissions?

Managing editor
Admin checklist criteria met?

Editor in chief
EIC checklist criteria met?

Associate Editor and Peer Reviewers
Content expectations met?

Editor-in-Chief
Decision
What’s the process for revised papers?

Revised paper and responses to comments

Reviewers

Satisfactory or unsatisfactory response? | Rescoring

Editor-in-chief
What items are on the Admin Checklist?

- Files checked for acceptability
- Appropriate Forms Received
- Color Figures OK
- Author has selected yes for ACVR Award

- Written in Standard English
- Tables in word format and on separate pages in the main document
- Abstract included in main document
- 300 dpi for images and 600 dpi for graphs or line drawings, 3 inches in width
What items are on the EIC checklist?

- Subject matter good fit for target audience of veterinary radiologists and radiation oncologists?
- Minimal overlap with previous publications?
- Consistent with author guidelines?
How are Ithenticate originality reports used?

- Exact duplicates of previously published sentences or paragraphs?
- If large number, either reject or send back to authors for correction.
- Thesis/dissertation posting on WWW
How are reviewers invited?

- Associate Editor
- Library database searches
- ScholarOne database
- Recommendations by authors and other invited reviewers.
- +/- Statistical consultant
How are peer reviewers charged?

- Confidentiality
- Scoring criteria
- VRU author guidelines
- ICMJE peer reviewer responsibilities
- How to use the ScholarOne system
What are peer reviewers asked to provide?

- Conflict of interest disclosure
- Detailed content checking and constructive critique
- Scoring for each of the VRU criteria
- Recommendations
What are the scoring criteria for VRU?

- originality, novelty
- significance, importance
- scientific quality, hypothesis, experimental design
- interest for VRU readers
- composition, clarity, and organization
- adherence to VRU author guidelines
How are peer reviews evaluated?

- Timeliness = within 28 days
- Relevance
  - Scores saved in ScholarOne database and considered for repeat invitations
What criteria are used for scoring review relevance?

- Line by line fact checking
  - errors, flaws in study design or logic, unclear statements, missing information, unclear figures
- Summary of strengths and weaknesses
- Constructively phrased recommendations for authors
- Bases for scores and acceptance recommendations explained in EIC comments

How is peer reviewer input used?

- Authors to respond to and address each reviewer concern as specifically as possible.
- Authors insert changes using Track changes.
- Editor reads author responses and revised paper.
- Re-invite reviewers +/-.
What factors other than peer reviewer input are considered for the final decision?

- Independent review
- Journal mission
- Preferred manuscript types
- Input from Consulting Editor of Experimental Design and Statistics
When is input from VRU’s Consulting Editor for Experimental Design and Statistics sought?

- When AE or peer reviewers request one
- When peer reviewer input is highly discordant
- When I have personal concerns about the study design or statistics
Editorial

Scientific Integrity and Professionalism: Do We Need to Expand the Curriculum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biomedical Publication Curriculum:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author selection criteria and criteria for authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript sections and appropriate content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures or illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript submission (importance and content of the cover letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use free online plagiarism check systems prior to submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor’s role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional review board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of potential misconduct issues and how to avoid them:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsification of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific misconduct case issues with discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-plagiarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate or redundant publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoting work of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image manipulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>