

1: Editorial Policy

The MDPI Editorial Process. MDPI operates a rigorous peer-review process. In most cases this is a single-blind assessment with at least two independent reviewers, followed by a final acceptance/rejection decision by the Editor-in-Chief, or another academic editor approved by the Editor-in-Chief.

Acquisition Editors are paid to acquire books that make a profit for the publisher. This consideration overrides those of prestige, duty to Literature, and personal conviction. Fortunately, good books, prestigious books, books that deserve to be published, can and do make a profit. This fact makes the job of the acquisitions editor both bearable and more difficult. First is the "sales department book," a non-fiction title with a predictable niche and appeal, whose profitability can be better estimated by a sales department than by an editor. Second is the "subsidiary rights title," a genre fiction title whose greatest hope for profit is sale to a mass-market paperback house. It is rarely successful, but when it is--e. Profitability is only indirectly related to sales. Thus an editor can take a smaller risk with an unknown author and small initial print-run--but it is still a risk, and it still must be justified financially. As described in the last section, editors find manuscripts in many places, and sometimes they originate the idea and find an author to flesh it out. The next step is to negotiate a contract with the author or her agent. Then the actual editing begins. The idea can originate with either the author or editor, and the collaboration can result from preference mutual regard or necessity an inexperienced or troubled author. In any case, developmental editing is the closest working relationship an editor can have with an author. Comprehensive Editing This term refers to the thorough editing of a completed manuscript. The extent and depth of editing, as well as the number of revisions, vary widely, depending on both author and editor. At one extreme, an editor can compile dozens of pages of notes and cover the text with copyediting marks. At the other, he can scribble "good! As mentioned earlier, the number of editors who are willing and able to do close editing or "line editing" seems to be diminishing. The fast pace and lack of job security in publishing today are certainly causing editors to favor manuscripts that require less editing--some would say these factors are simply causing them to skimp on editing. Copyeditors are a special breed: An abiding love of the written language and devotion to authors and books is all that can explain their continued existence. Correcting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and usage. Finding and fixing inconsistencies in all of the above, plus tone, style, and narrative detail. To varied extents, checking the validity of factual assertions, dates, titles, etc. The copyeditor receives a clean copy of the manuscript from the editor, preferably with a cover letter listing special problems or considerations. She proceeds, using reference guides such as the Chicago Manual of Style and a recent, authoritative dictionary, to make corrections and suggested changes directly in the text. Queries to the author e. The author is then asked to review and approve all changes and answer the queries. The copyeditor or another employee then enters all the changes in the digital file, and the manuscript is ready for layout. Fact-Checking For certain non-fiction books, at certain publishers, fact-checkers are employed. The job requires a disciplined mind, unusual persistence and resourcefulness, and the knack of asking niggling questions of strangers without annoying them too much. Usually fact-checkers start as early in the process as possible, so as to avoid delaying production. Proofreading Once the book has "gone into pages" been laid out or typeset , a printed copy goes to both the author and a proofreader for a final edit. This edit is the most minute and delimited of all edits. Proofreaders look for errors in the layout elements such as font size, headings, margins, etc. The author is generally charged for changes beyond a word here or there, and the proofreader is expected to bring up issues at the sentence level only if necessary. Many proofreaders, in fact, work backwards, so that their vigilance is not compromised by actual reading. Once the proofreader and author have returned their "proofs," final changes are made, and the editing process is over.

2: The Editorial Process -

Thanks for this information. I am a newbie in the publishing world and don't know much about the editing process. This post terrifies me because of the daunting process, and encourages me because of the possible opportunity to work with other professionals to make my manuscript the best it can be.

A summary of the editorial process is given in the flowchart below. The following provides notes on each step.

Pre-check Immediately after submission, this check is initially carried out by the managing editor to assess: The Academic Editor, i.

Peer-review The process is single-blind for most journals, meaning that the author does not know the identity of the reviewer, but the reviewer knows the identity of the author. Some journals operate double-blind peer review. At least two review reports are collected for each submitted article. Suggestions of reviewers can be made by the academic editor during pre-check. Alternatively, MDPI editorial staff will use qualified Editorial Board Members, qualified reviewers from our database, or new reviewers identified by web searches for related articles. The following checks are applied to all reviewers: That they hold no conflicts of interest with the authors, including if they have published together in the last five years; That they hold a PhD exceptions are made in some fields, e.

To assist academic editors, MDPI staff handle all communication with reviewers, authors, and the external editor; however, Academic Editors can check the status of manuscripts and the identity of reviewers at any time. Reviewers are given two weeks to write their review. For the review of a revised manuscript, reviewers are asked to provide their report within three days. In both cases, extensions can be granted on request. A paper can only be accepted for publication by an academic editor. Employed MDPI staff can only reject papers: MDPI journals operate an open peer review option, meaning that the authors have the option to publish the review reports and author responses with the published paper often referred to as open reports. In addition, reviewers may choose to sign their reports if the review is published, in which case the reviewer name appears on the review report referred to as open identity. The default option is for reviewers to remain anonymous and for reports not to be published, reviewers and authors respectively must opt into this option. If an article is rejected no details will be published. Open peer review has the benefit of increasing transparency about the review process and providing further information about the paper for interested readers and we encourage authors to choose open review. Further background can be found on our blog.

Editor Decision Acceptance decisions on manuscripts, after peer review, are made by an academic editor, either the Editor-in-Chief, a Guest Editor, or another suitable Editorial Board member. When making an editorial decision, we expect that the academic editor checks the following: The suitability of selected reviewers; Adequacy of reviewer comments and author response; Overall scientific quality of the paper. The editor can select from: If there is any suspicion that a paper may contain plagiarism, the editorial office will check using the industry standard iThenticate software. Reviewers make recommendations, and Editors-in-Chief are free to disagree with their views. If they do so, they should justify their decision, for the benefit of the authors. Editorial independence is extremely important and MDPI does not interfere with editorial decisions. In particular, no paper is published without the agreement of an academic editor and MDPI staff do not advise academic editors about accepting or rejecting articles.

Revision In cases where only minor revisions are recommended, the author is usually requested to revise the paper before referring to the external editor. Articles may or may not be sent to reviewers after author revision, dependent on whether the reviewer requested to see the revised version and the wishes of the Academic editor. Apart from in exceptional circumstances, we allow a maximum of two rounds of major revision per manuscript. The MDPI editorial process. Language editing is carried out by professional English editing staff. The authors are also free to use other English editing service, or consult a native English-speaking colleague—the latter being our preferred option.

The Role of the Editor-in-Chief The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the academic quality of the publication process. This includes making final decisions on manuscripts, or approving scholars to whom the decision can be delegated. The Editor-in-Chief also approves new Editorial Board members. All MDPI editorial staff are trained in how to detect and respond to ethical problems. Details on ethical considerations for submitting papers can be found in the instructions for authors of journals see here , for example. Ethical

issues raised by readers of the journal will be investigated by the editorial office following procedures recommended by COPE. Disputes on the validity of research reported in published papers can be settled by the editorial board. For disputes around authorship, data ownership, author misconduct, etc. Authors are asked to respond to any substantiated allegations made against them. The guidelines comprehensively cover all aspects of editing, from how the journal is managed to details about peer review and handling complaints. The majority of the recommendations are not specific to medical journals and are followed by all MDPI journals. We encourage authors to verify their work against the checklist and flow diagram and upload them with their submission. TOP covers transparency and openness in the reporting of research. Our journals aim to be at level 1 or 2 for all aspects of TOP. Specific requirements vary between journals and can be requested from the editorial office. Authors are recommended to complete the checklist and flow diagram and include it with their submission. Authors are recommended to verify their work against the checklist and include it with their submission. Compliance with the standards and guidelines above will be taken into account during the final decision and any discrepancies should be clearly explained by the authors. We recommend that authors highlight relevant guidelines in their cover letter.

3: Editorial Review Process for Journal of Marriage and Family | National Council on Family Relations

Spine-Health's editorial process and peer-review system are designed to support the mission of the Website, namely: To provide comprehensive, highly informative, and useful resources for understanding, preventing, and seeking appropriate treatment for back pain.

That part of the process was taken care of by half a dozen staff editors who would pay meticulous attention to detail through all levels of editing before your manuscript went to press. There were rarely mistakes in books in those days. Yes, those were wonderful times for the chosen few authors who managed to find a publisher. Professional editing is essential Today, things have changed dramatically in the publishing world. Agents are far more likely to take a manuscript seriously if it has already been professionally edited. Big publishers and small alike do not have time, money, or staff to give your manuscript the editorial attention to detail it might have received a few decades ago. With so many self-published books on the market, quality is vitally important if you want to be competitive. The top complaint in Amazon reviews of self-published books is the lack of professional editing. Good editing is one of your best marketing tools. [Click here to read more about self-publishing versus traditional publishing.](#) Some or all of these steps may or may not apply to you, depending on the nature of your work and your budget. See my page on [How to hire a freelance editor.](#) You work with your editor to determine the type of editing required. Or you may need developmental, structural, stylistic, or copy editing or a combination thereof. Or perhaps your editing has already been completed by another editor, and you simply require a proofread. Copy editing is most often requested from the spectrum of different types of manuscript editing. [Click here for complete definitions of these editorial tasks.](#) A first pass of editing is completed by your editor. A single editing pass will usually take two to five weeks, depending on the complexity, the type of editing required, and the length of the manuscript. Additional time will be needed for manual, on-paper editing. A good designer will also help you acquire an ISBN number and assist you with the details on the copyright page cataloguing-in-publication or CIP page. The edited manuscript is returned to you with tracked changes showing. The revisions stage is very important. Together you and your editor will determine if a second editing pass or partial second pass to review your revisions would be a good idea. If so, the editor completes the second editing pass, returning it to you again for approving and incorporating the changes and making further revisions. At the end of the process, you accept all changes and comments, creating a clean document. If the editing has been done manually, on paper, either you or your editor will need to type the corrections and changes into the electronic document. However, you may feel more comfortable with choosing this method. You will want to proofread for any formatting issues such as bad word or line breaks. If your manuscript is going to print, the clean MS Word file is now sent to your book designer, who prepares the design and layout and does the typesetting, usually in a professional layout program called InDesign. The result of this work is the page proofs, which are saved as a PDF file. If you are working with a publishing services company, they will often do a basic cover and interior page layout for you, but make sure they are using a professional layout program like InDesign, and not MS Word. Interior page design can be done in MS Word, but the result is amateurish. Your editor or another editor or proofreader proofreads the PDF page proofs, using similar markup tools as those in MS Word, and checks for any remaining errors, inconsistencies, and layout problems. A proofread is a good idea because errors can still exist in the manuscript in three ways: The proofread proofs are reviewed and approved by you. Your book designer inputs the changes to the proofs, then sends you a mock-up for your final approval. Your manuscript editing, design, and proofreading are complete, and your professionally edited and designed book is ready to go to print.

4: NetRead: How To: Editors: The Editorial Process

Editorial process On submission, authors should select the Academic Editor they feel is most appropriate to handle their manuscript. If that Editor is unable to handle the manuscript, it will generally be sent to an author's second or third choice Editor - depending on availability.

Your explanation matches my experiences with my US traditional publishers. My former novels were based on the ancient Aleut culture and language, and a style sheet would have saved my line editor a lot of headaches! Reply Gillian Marchenko February 6, at 7: This post terrifies me because of the daunting process, and encourages me because of the possible opportunity to work with other professionals to make my manuscript the best it can be. Reply Lindsay Harrel February 6, at 7: Reply Rick Barry February 6, at 7: I worked five years as a project manager for a publisher of textbooks. We had to keep a close eye on enthusiastic proofreaders who sometimes altered facts due to their misunderstanding or who tried to rewrite sentences to match their own writing styles. Also frustrating was one author who, after seeing a galley of revisions, took a red pencil and tried to order us to change every edited word back to the way it was in her original, imperfect manuscript. We edit grocery lists and evaluate the church bulletin! Reply Timothy Fish February 6, at 8: When we look at the definitions, revise refers to looking over something again, in order to improve it. To edit is to prepare for publication or to cause it to conform to a standard. I would think that an author can do either or both. But most certainly, an author can make corrections for publication or to conform to a standard. Reply Sundi Jo February 6, at 8: I know the process will include tearing my baby apart, telling me what sucks and needs fixed, then putting it back together. Reply Robin Patchen February 6, at 9: I look forward to the editing process, because I believe that in many counselors, or in this case, editors, there is success. Steve Laube February 6, at 9: Janet Ann Collins February 6, at Steve Laube February 6, at I am now up to seven corrections on the original post. Readers found six more. Someday I will be inerrant. Only God is inerrant. I just LOVE eating humble pie. And I continually prove that fact in a public blog. Steve Janet Ann Collins February 6, at Reply Ruth Douthitt February 6, at 9: This post aligns with what I experienced with my first book. I work with a very thorough editor who does both the copy edit and the substantive edit. He finds gaps in my story that I never even realized! As a result, the book was much better. And even after all that editing! I still found errors in the published book. But, it is all a learning process! I still enjoy the process, too. Reply Peter DeHaan February 6, at 3: The last time I had a paper version edited with a pen as in the picture was in college, which was more than a few years ago. Iola February 6, at 6: Reply Steve Laube February 6, at 6: Merely volunteer your editorial eye and hope it gets to the right place. The publisher has enough to do without having to respond to everyone who sends in a note. Reply Roberta Hegland February 7, at Steve, has the downsizing of publishing houses resulted in more typos? It seems so to me. Most notable was a paragraph which had the lines switched up. Reply Carrie Daws February 26, at I love my editors for helping me to look and sound so good!

5: Fortune Journals | Guidelines

In a digital world, information only matters if it's timely, relevant, and credible. We promise to do whatever is necessary to get you the information you need when you need it, to make our.

Who writes Wikipedia and meta: Power structure There are tens of thousands of regular editors – everyone from expert scholars to casual readers. With the exception of blocked users, anyone who visits the site can edit it, and this fact has encouraged contribution of a tremendous amount of content. There are mechanisms that help community members watch for bad edits, a few hundred administrators with special powers to enforce good behavior, and a judicial-style arbitration committee that considers the few situations remaining unresolved, and decides on withdrawal or restriction of editing privileges or other sanctions when needed, after all other consensus remedies have been tried. Overall Wikipedia gets hundreds of times more well-meaning editors than bad ones, so problematic editors rarely obtain much of a foothold. In the normal course of events, the primary control over editorship is the effective utilization of the large number of well-intentioned editors to overcome issues raised by the much smaller number of problematic editors. This assumption is still being tested and its limitations and reliability are not yet a settled matter – Wikipedia is a pioneer in communal knowledge building of this kind. Balancing this, there is also a wide range of resources for editors seeking to improve their articles or within their areas of interest. The Wikipedia community is largely self-organizing, so that anyone may build a reputation as a competent editor and become involved in any role they may choose, subject to peer approval. Editors who find that editorial administrator responsibility would benefit their ability to help the community may ask their peers in the community for agreement to undertake such roles; a structure which enforces meritocracy and communal standards of editorship and conduct. Such rights are stringently restricted, ensuring that editorial and administrative matters are separated powers and only rarely lead to editorial conflict of interest. Core community level controls The degree of oversight possible with tens of thousands of bona fide editors. The wiki system itself, which as operated, appears to strongly select for robust and best collaborative knowledge of many people even on contentious topics, rather than the unrepresentative viewpoint or negative impact of a few. Editorial panels and processes Widely respected and enforced policies which provide all editors with a solid basis to take matters into their own hands in addressing both deliberate and innocent bad edits. A consensus-based ethos, which beneficially impacts the decision-making process. Escalation processes whereby poor conduct or articles being problematically edited will tend to come to the attention of a wider range of editors with authority or willingness to act on them, making vandalism very short term and ultimately somewhat futile. A wide range of fine-grained editorial processes such as dispute resolution, mediation, third-party opinion, and requests for comment and consultation within the wider Wikipedia community. Software-facilitated controls Systems built into its editing software that make it easy for a large number of editors to watch for vandalism, monitor recent changes, and check activity in articles in personalised watchlists, in real time. Design decisions in the software that make identifying and reverting any number of bad edits possible at the click of a button, whereas vandalism itself takes longer to do. Ability to set fine-grained software blocks on problematic editors, and partially or fully protect targeted articles. Controls under development The control known as flagged revisions is being rolled out as of [update]. It aims to differentiate the version shown to most readers, from the draft "cutting edge" version being edited, and in the first instance to only show the latter when it has been checked for reasonableness. This system is expected to provide a powerful way to prevent most vandalism or poor quality edits from being seen by readers, once it is fully operational. At any given time, a large number of the thousands of active Wikipedians will be using, checking, or editing the articles held. Each of these has their own watchlist, a special page that lists changes to the articles they have worked on or are otherwise choosing to watch. Hundreds of Wikipedians use automated software tools described below to watch edits en masse. On average, only a few minutes lie between a blatantly bad or harmful edit, and some editor noticing and acting on it. Repeated edits tend to lead rapidly to escalation of the process, further safeguards and actions, and the involvement of others, including possible use of administrator powers or dispute resolution depending on the

situation. The primary control therefore is not so much that "only approved editors" can update and improve articles. Even bad editors can edit but any vandalism and errors they add rarely get much of a foothold and their bad edits are rapidly spotted and reversed by others. This is different from traditional knowledge and publishing, which attempts to limit content creation to a relatively small circle of approved editors in an attempt to exercise strong hierarchical control. A study by IBM found that as a result of this process, most vandalism on the English Wikipedia is reverted within five minutes: Men are not more zealous for truth than they often are for error, and a sufficient application of legal or even of social penalties will generally succeed in stopping the propagation of either. The real advantage which truth has, consists in this, that when an opinion is true, it may be extinguished once, twice, or many times, but in the course of ages there will generally be found persons to rediscover it, until some one of its reappearances falls on a time when from favourable circumstances it escapes persecution until it has made such head as to withstand all subsequent attempts to suppress it. Experience suggests that any appearance of weakness which may be created is deceptive. It turns out that in some ways, analytic skills and neutrality often play a greater role than specialisation; editors who have worked for a time on a variety of articles usually become quite capable of making good quality editorial decisions regarding specialist material, even on unfamiliar technical subjects. In general, the role of Wikipedia editors is guided by two principles. Attempts to add information which is of poor quality or questionable are easy to spot, by the many other editors reviewing a given topic, who generally come with different viewpoints and understandings initially. For facts to remain in an article requires consensus amongst often dozens or hundreds of diverse editors with an interest in the article, that the fact is agreed, and neutrally and appropriately presented in a balanced manner, with any statement considered to require citation being properly sourced. Editors on most articles will often include coverage of a range of viewpoints on the subject, and will often include a number of specialists. Over time, experience suggests that as a result of this collaboration on a large scale, articles do usually rise to this general standard, and many long-standing articles having survived this process of examination over the years are stable, robust, and well written as a result. Controversial articles often highlight the success of this approach - the process of developing a wording that satisfies a consensus of often-opposed editors is not a trivial one and can be watched repeatedly playing out on articles over time. The Wiki structure[edit] It is possible that this selectivity for collaboration is in part due to the Wiki structure. Editors who disagree are unable to write alternative articles or versions to express their differing viewpoints. Ultimately there is only one page upon which all must edit. Since other aspects of the editorial process tend to reduce sustained "edit warring", and strong universally accepted viewpoints describe how opposing views are to be neutrally included and presented, ultimately there is great pressure in the long term, for a common agreed version to emerge on that one page. Once it has done so, then it is the usual stance of editors who have worked for this goal, no matter their viewpoint, that it will only be replaced by a better version. Another aspect is that because of the wide-open nature of the editorial process, there is no bottleneck of control through which the content can readily be controlled or massaged by any given individual or interest group. As well, all edits and actions, including past historical versions, are visible to all editors. The Wiki model itself mitigates extremely strongly against control of articles being manipulated by any one interest group, as there are no obvious applicable points of weakness or "approved circle", through which editorial decisions must pass. As a result, maintaining vandalism or a specific viewpoint is all but impossible in the long term, and Wikipedia is extremely resilient long-term against bias, censorship, or manipulation of its articles. Five pillars Rules and policies must strike a fine balance between good and necessary practice, and abuse or game-playing, in order to be effective in dealing with would-be disruptive contributors. Examples of the former include core policies on neutral presentation and balance, proper verifiability and citation of sources, and policies on editorial conduct, dispute and disruption, and types of acceptable content. These policies are substantially agreed by the entire community as the basis for the entire editorial approach, and have very high "buy in". These meta-policies in turn are unlikely to be sanctioned if it is the perception that their use is motivated by a wish to game the system rather than bona fide reasons. Official policies and Official guidelines. Consensus based ethos[edit] The community has a very strong buy-in to consensus decision-making, underscored by

guidelines such as [Wikipedia: Consensus](#) , and [Wikipedia: Polling](#) is not a substitute for discussion. Consensus is not the same as majority, it signifies that the concerns and views of minorities should be taken into account in the attempt to gain a decision which reflects community values and which most can live by to some extent or other. Most policies and procedures also develop and become refined in this same manner. The time taken to reach some decisions is often considered to be outweighed by the wide agreement when decisions are reached. Even in the event of dispute and escalation, the process remains the same -- even Arbitration Committee decisions are based upon communal input, consensus, and transparency. Escalation processes and dispute resolution[edit] There are a number of escalation processes inherent in the Wikipedia model. Some function autonomously, others are accessible to anybody who notes a concern. Autonomous escalation includes, as a simple example, that repeated vandalism of an article will tend to gather attention from more editors, who will begin to specifically watch that article for changes, or who add it to their Vandalism Software if in use to flag every edit as needing checking. Articles in good order and lacking obvious problems also have a comprehensive review system, in this case one which obtains communal input and addresses quality and standards compliance, including quality based peer review upwards. Other editor-instigated escalation processes include the entirety of the dispute resolution process i. Editorial decisions such as page deletions likewise have fine grained policies and escalation processed, with speedy delete for obvious nonsense and prodding for almost-certain violations, which can be escalated into the full communal review system of Articles for deletion in which articles and their justifications are discussed communally for up to a week in order to reach consensus on their treatment. An arbitration committee sits at the top of all editorial and editor conduct disputes. Edit monitoring and software facilitation[edit] [Wikipedia: List of Wikipedians by number of edits](#) lists some statistics on editorial involvement. Reputable editors who decide to monitor recent edits more seriously will often use software such as [VandalProof](#) , a program written for Wikipedia by [AmiDaniel](#) , as well as functionality that automatically flags changes by known problem editors. They will use this software to watch hundreds of recent edits in " real time " as they happen. Other automated corrections, such as bad links, typographic errors and spellchecking, bot-assisted identification of unused fair-use images, and some forms of vandalism, are automatically fixed by bots , automated programs written by Wikipedians and operated by authorisation. There are also large user-groups dedicated to rapid reversal of vandalism, such as [Recent changes patrol](#) and the [Counter-Vandalism Unit](#). These systems are often near-immediate. For example, the article on the [United Kingdom](#) , vandalised at [As of \[update\]](#) , approximately editors use [VandalProof](#) alone, providing significant overlap in monitoring editorial quality. Other tools and user groups focussing on monitoring edits as they happen or subsequently, are listed at: [Blocking and protection systems](#)[edit] A variety of timed and untimed controls for blocking problematic editors and protecting pages from poor editors are accessible within the Wikipedia software. These can intelligently filter out combinations of accounts, IPs or named users, and protect pages from IP, new or non-established editors. They are used to enforce both short and long term blocking decisions, and to lock pages and deter vandalism, as necessary, if lesser steps seem to be inappropriate. A number of editors deliberately look for such tagged articles to work on them. Articles needing expert attention , and the assistance with neutrality user-group. Effects of control systems[edit] An average time to revert edits is usually a few minutes on most articles, and if an article is hit with repeated vandalism then more editors will tend to notice, and start to actively watch the article to reduce the risk of recurrence or "lock" it if it becomes necessary. Popular articles especially on current affairs might get hundreds of edits a day, and be reviewed by dozens of editors out of the several hundred thousand on Wikipedia. This degree of watchfulness around the clock makes it hard for vandalism to get established in most articles. Types of access[edit] There are various permissions within the Mediawiki software, allowing users to perform various communal functions. The most commonly known of these are: Any editor , whether with an account or otherwise. Editors are encouraged to be bold and become involved at all levels. In the early days of Wikipedia all editors acted as administrators, and in principle they are encouraged to act with similar responsibility today as well. Any editor in good standing with a strong track record of experience can be nominated for adminship, a process that is based upon communal approval by editors at large, in which any established editor may express an opinion. Unless an actual administrative issue arises, administrators edit like

any other user. Respect is not gained as a result of being an administrator; rather being an administrator is a result of respect gained, combined with a wish to undertake more responsibility on janitorial tasks. Bureaucrats are administrators who are entrusted to effect the decision of the community in appointing and removing administrators and in granting and removing bot rights from the advice of the Bot Approvals Group. They have few other additional rights. As these roles require a high level of trust, they are granted only to those users approved by the Arbitration Committee or by direct appointment and their actions are subject to regular monitoring.

6: Editorial Process and Staff | The Medical Letter, Inc.

Acquired content, depending on the source, may enter the editorial process at this stage. Step 2 - Content Review In Step 2, members of the Medical Review Board (MRB) and/or physicians from our external partner, VeriMed Healthcare Network, review all of the content.

Consists primarily of consensus medical opinion. Plain Language Policy A. The information is designed to be easily accessible, visually pleasing, and informative. We strive for a 5th to 7th grade reading level, logical organization, short sentences and common everyday words, and design features that make the content easy to read, understand, and use. Some of our more in-depth content is written at a higher reading level for readers who wish to pursue a more advanced study of health topics. Medical Review Board A. Review content in their specialty areas Ensure content is up-to-date with the most recent treatment guidelines and practices, important studies, breakthrough drugs, and drug warnings Help the A. Editorial Team perform consistency checks across products Physicians on the A. Medical Review Board are affiliated with leading institutions across the country, including top hospitals as ranked by U. News and World Report. Physicians are chosen to review or write medical content only in the clinical areas in which they have been formally trained and actively practice. They are board certified for that specialty, where applicable. Members of the A. Medical Review Board are listed below. Allergy and Immunology Stuart I. Emergency Medicine Jacob L. Infectious Disease Jatin M. Internal Medicine Laura J. Nurse Practitioner Jennifer K. Surgery, General Debra G. VeriMed Healthcare Network A. VeriMed is a comprehensive group of over practicing, board-certified physician writers and educators representing all medical subspecialties. VeriMed doctors are affiliated with leading institutions across the country, including the top hospitals as ranked by U. VeriMed physicians are chosen to review or write medical content only in the clinical areas in which they have been formally trained and actively practice. They are board certified or board eligible for that specialty, where applicable. Some of these physician reviewers are listed below. General Surgery Mary C. Orthopedic Surgery Thomas N. Review provided by VeriMed Healthcare Network. All new and updated articles are then reviewed and approved by a member of our medical review board with expertise in the subject area. Internal personnel have a minimum of 5 years of experience writing and editing health content. Articles reviewed by this team of professionals are referenced using "A. Members of this team are listed below. Prior to joining A. Zieve served as editor and product manager at Milliman Care Guidelines. Milliman is considered the industry standard for independently developed and produced evidence-based clinical guidelines used in a variety of web-based case management applications in hospitals, insurance companies, and case management agencies. Brenda Conaway, Editorial Director With over 20 years of experience producing medical content for a range of audiences, Brenda Conaway has an extensive background in Consumer Health. For the past three years, Brenda has played a pivotal role in the development of new content and products, using her experience to improve existing A. AM products and making sure that our products are evidence-based. In her role as Editorial Director for A. M, Brenda oversees strategic content development and overall editorial operations, ensuring that all A. Before that, she was Senior Editorial Manager at StayWell, where she managed the editorial department, overseeing the production of more than 60 custom publications and producing award-winning content for both consumers and health care providers. Theodora Szasz, MD, PhD, Managing Editor Theodora Szasz has broad expertise in medical writing and biomedical science after more than 15 years combined experience in research and clinical practice. Prior to joining the A. Internal editorial team A. Some members of the writing team have clinical backgrounds. Their work is carefully scrutinized for medical accuracy, adherence to our centrist editorial voice, and patient and consumer friendliness. Editors receive ongoing evaluation, feedback, and encouragement from staff physicians and senior editors at A. Medical Illustration Team Our team of physicians also reviews all illustrations, animations, and supporting text. Johnson has played key roles in product development since Dan has been instrumental in creating the look and feel of A. His expertise has enabled A. User Feedback Mechanism User feedback is important to us. All comments are read by our Senior Editorial staff and assessed for importance. If comments indicate a serious issue with an article, a full medical

review can be triggered and the feedback is given to the physician to use while reviewing the article. If a comment relates to medical accuracy, any changes made are based on a physician review of the comment. Smaller issues such as typos and broken links are fixed as soon as possible. Suggestions for new articles, images, and animations are always appreciated. To give us some feedback please send an email to Consumer Health Support, using the email form located at located at: If a response is requested, we will make every attempt to contact the commenter within three 3 business days. The content is displayed in HTML, and consists primarily of text, images, or animation content. Browser plug-ins are required to view some content types, and can be downloaded free from various third party websites. One of the most useful technologies for enabling website access for the visually impaired is the Alternate tag ALT tag standard, supported by HTML and most browsers. With a text reader, a visually impaired user can get an audio description of the ALT-tagged image or link, thus providing the end user the ability to navigate a site. Third Party Content A. This content may or may not contain all information normally included in our articles, such as the specific reviewer name. Availability of reviewer information is one of the criterion by which we judge third party content. As vendors are found and reviewed, A. Health Management Tools A. Information in these tools is written in plain language and is drawn from the medical evidence and major clinical guidelines as documented in the references section. References are provided for each individual tool. All tools are reviewed and approved by two people every 2 years, including a physician. These regulations govern issues such as acceptance or denial of advertisements and or sponsorship by A. This policy may be modified at any time using A. If a modification occurs, A. Clients who license our content may place advertising on the individual content pages, and may use words, design, or placement to differentiate this from their A. The client has the ability to decide how to differentiate between A. All content found on our website or licensed to our clients has been created by, provided by, or influenced by either A. Vendors must also have safeguards against editorial conflicts of interest. All physicians must also disclose any conflict-of-interest affiliations when they agree to an assignment. If conflict of interest is determined, the physician will be reassigned or steps will be taken to rectify the situation. Conflict-of-interest affiliations can include: Research support including grants, salaries, equipment, supplies, and other expenses by organizations, pharmaceutical companies, or medical device companies that may gain or lose financially through their work as a consumer health reviewer. Recent or current engagement in a research project or anticipated employment by any organization, pharmaceutical company, or medical device company that may gain or lose financially through their work as a consumer health reviewer. Stocks, shares, consultation fees, or other forms of payment from any organization, pharmaceutical company, or medical device company that may gain or lose financially through their work as a consumer health reviewer; and patents or patent applications that may be affected by their work as a consumer health reviewer. Disclosures must be made to the appropriate manager, director, or vice president at hiring or when said interest develops. Supervisors will review with company officers to decide if there is a conflict of interest. If conflict of interest is determined, the staff member will be reassigned or steps will be taken to rectify the situation. Our review partner, VeriMed, asks their professionals about potential conflicts of interest and discloses any potential conflicts of interest to A. To date, no reviewers have had any conflicts of interest. In these instances, the content does not, nor will it ever, contain any mention of URAC or display the seal. Autonomy of Editorial Department All A. Editorial and Visual Production staff members must disclose conflict-of-interest affiliations with any organization, pharmaceutical company, or medical device company. Disclosures must be made to the appropriate manager, director, or vice president at hiring or when such an interest develops. Supervisors review with company officers to decide if a conflict of interest does exist. If conflict of interest is determined, the staff member is reassigned or steps are taken to rectify the situation. All Medical Review Board physicians working on an A. If conflict of interest is determined, the physician is reassigned or steps are taken to rectify the situation. Our review partner, VeriMed Healthcare Network, asks their professionals about potential conflicts of interest and discloses any potential conflicts of interest to A.

7: Editorial Process | Molecular Biology and Evolution | Oxford Academic

The Editorial Process A Step-by-Step Guide to Readyng a Book for Publication. These days, it seems everyone wants to self-publish a book. And that is both a.

Each manuscript selected for in-depth review is sent to at least two external reviewers with the ability to fairly assess the technical merits of the paper. These peer reviewers provide a ranking Low to Very High for the manuscript for one or more of the following criteria: These criteria resemble the questions for which the authors have provided answers during the initial submission process. In addition, peer reviewers provide written comments outlining the strengths and weaknesses of the work. MBE editors use this information and their own expertise to arrive at the final publication priority for each manuscript. We are committed to publishing all manuscripts receiving the high or top priority recommendation, while those receiving medium priority will be considered for publication on a case-by-case basis. How to interpret Decision Letters? Once the peer review and editorial process is completed, the author will receive one of the following notifications. Editors may choose to send the manuscript back to the original reviewers, and sometimes to additional reviewers, in order to make a final decision. Manuscripts requiring more than one substantial revision are routinely rejected. For rejected manuscripts, editors may occasionally suggest that the authors resubmit their manuscript after improving it. In this case, the revised manuscript must be submitted as a new manuscript online; they must indicate previous manuscript number and provide response to editorial and reviewer comments, along with a statement that they have been advised to resubmit the manuscript in the decision letter. What is fast track? The Editor-in-Chief will select manuscripts receiving the highest publication priority designation during the review process. Upon acceptance as with all MBE manuscripts , these contributions will be published online within one week and in the print edition of MBE in the next scheduled issue. How to appeal an editorial decision? Authors appealing a reject decision must submit a rebuttal detailing a point-by-point response to reviewer and editor comments no revised manuscripts please. The rebuttal should clearly explain how authors can update the manuscript to handle the concerns raised, and can be sent to the Editor-in-Chief by email EIC. This decision will generally take weeks. If the authors are permitted to resubmit the manuscript it must be submitted as a NEW manuscript. It will be subjected to initial review, which is followed by the reviewers in-depth review for a subset of all manuscripts submitted. An author cannot appeal an editorial decision when the manuscript is rejected without an in-depth review. Cover Art for MBE? The final acceptance letter invites authors to provide cover-worthy art. Manuscripts comprising a part or parts that have previously been published or are under consideration for publication elsewhere should not be submitted to MBE. Updated on 14th January

8: Editorial Process - CNET

Step Editorial Process For over 25 years, TRC has been using an exhaustive editorial process to deliver the most trusted, practical advice and recommendations available on drug therapy and medication management.

9: MDPI | The Editorial Process

Editorial Process This section provides a brief general overview of the editorial process at the AACR journals. Details of which editors oversee and are responsible for making decisions on manuscripts at certain decision stages can vary depending on the journal and whether the journal staff includes an internal Executive Editor.

Eenadu epaper Risk Quantitation and Regulatory Policy (Banbury Report (Banbury Report) Beyond medical care And the angels were silent School Resegregation Edict of Claudius De Civitate Anaunorum First aid step 3 fourth edition MTEL Middle School Mathematics/Science 51 Competition: Is it a guy thing? Karting back in the day Jonas of Kiivijarvi Concrete Mixture Proportioning (Modern Concrete Technology) Jennys birthday party Discovering Computers 2002 Concepts for a Digital World, Web Enhanced, Introductory Html 4 cheat sheet Reason, faith and authority in Christianity Preaching in and out of season A Family Apart (Orphan Train Adventures) Hydroelectric license in Wyoming The New Oxford Annotated Bible, New Revised Standard Version (Burgundy Leather) V. 21-22 Philosophie: Aging and its discontents Muslims are not only Muslims Privacy, information, and technology Conversion of pages to Sponge activities Manhattan gre rc guide Diary of a Mediocre Mom Xochitl and the flowers Letters written during the Civil War, 1861-1865 The churchill factor how one man made history The gold standard illusion Restricted advertising and competition Regionalism, territorial politics in Canada and the United States Contesting the Subject Heat transfer and thermal-stress analysis with abaqus Third time lucky Tanya Huff On / Forensic Digital Imaging and Photography (With CD-ROM) California mechanics lien law handbook Jean-Jacques Rousseau, musicien.