

ANZ Journal of Surgery Editor Guidelines

This document outlines the key tasks and responsibilities for ANZ J Surgery Speciality Editors as well as guidelines on how to manage these tasks.

Key Roles and Responsibilities

The key roles and responsibilities of an ANZ J Surgery Speciality Editor (SE) are:

- Assess the suitability of submissions for publication, evaluating the novelty, importance, scope and quality of the manuscript
- Identify and assign two appropriate reviewers to assess each manuscript
- Assess reviewer comments and make a recommendation based on these comments as well as your own judgements
- Prepare detailed comments about the research and the manuscript to help authors improve their work. This may involve moderating comments made by reviewers.

Best Practice for Managing Submissions

Monitoring your SE Centre (ScholarOne housekeeping)

SEs will receive notifications when an action is needed (i.e. new manuscript assignment, reviewer selection due, editor recommendation, etc). We expect SEs check their account regularly for any updates on the progress of manuscripts.

We ask SEs to update their ScholarOne account when they are unavailable by registering these dates in their account or directly emailing the Editorial Assistant (EA). To register away dates in ScholarOne please click [Edit Account](#) located on the top right of your ScholarOne home page

Initial Evaluation of Manuscripts

Only manuscripts that warrant a full review should undergo peer-review. This means that the manuscript must meet these criteria:

- Must report on new or important research of interest to ANZ J Surgery readers
- Must be a reasonable standard using sound English expression and quality tables and figures
- Must be use a standard consistent with the submission type (e.g. review used appropriate methods etc)

If a full review is not warranted, the SE should recommend an immediate reject. This can be done on the Manuscript Details Page, by manually changing the progress box number from

‘2’ to ‘0’. This will forward the manuscript to the SE recommendation page where the SE must provide a brief justification for their decision in the comment boxes provided.

During these checks SEs should keep these principles in mind:

- The health and safety of all participants were not compromised
- Ethical standards were maintained

If the research does not meet these best practice standards the paper should be rejected.

Consent to Publication

For the Images for Surgeons article type the editorial assistant will check that the authors have obtained consent to publication per the journal standardised submission question.

However, SEs should note that even if not explicitly *about* a patient any identifying info provided requires the authors to obtain consent to publication. SEs should be alert for potential identifying information for example, descriptions of individual case histories, photos, x-rays, or genetic pedigrees.

If you note this, please contact the editorial office.

For more information, COPE guidelines to publishing medical case reports are available [here](#)

Conflict of Interest

SEs should disclose interests that might appear to affect their ability to present or review work objectively.

Competing interests may be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious. If you are currently employed at the same institution as any of the authors or have been recent mentors, mentees, close collaborators or joint grant holders (within the past 3 years) you should not review this paper.

In these cases, SEs should email the EA directly and ask that the manuscript be re-assigned.

General Notes

If there are certain aspects of the paper, you do not feel qualified to comment on (e.g. complex statistical analyses) you can state this in the comment boxes at the recommendation stage. If the subject is completely outside your area, ask for the paper to be re-assigned by emailing the EA or EIC.

Manuscript requires an English language edit

When the manuscript’s content is suitable, but the standard of language is too poor to be reviewed we suggest the SE recommends a rejection with specific SE comments.

The following is recommended:

The contents of your submission are of interest to our readership and we would like to consider it for publication. However, the English expression is poor, and we strongly

suggest you have your paper copyedited. You can use your own personal or institutional contacts to do this. Alternatively, Wiley offers editing support - please visit <http://wileyeditingservices.com/en/>

Please note that copyediting does NOT guarantee acceptance for publication. Contact the EA if you have further questions.

If the language has deficiencies but the text can be relatively easily understood and the content/research is good, then it can be sent for review and to mention to reviewers that you know there is a language problem and confirm that these minor copyediting issues will be corrected in copyediting stage if the manuscript is accepted.

If you are still unsure, please discuss with the EIC.

Selecting Reviewers

SEs must ensure that reviewers have the expertise to conduct a review.

- For ANZ J Surgery, at least **2 reviews are needed**. This can be two experts in the field **or** one expert and a detailed review from the SE.
- We recommend that the SE selects **two reviewers and alternates**, so if a reviewer is unavailable or declines then an alternative is automatically invited
- When the reviewers' recommendations disagree e.g. one reviewer recommends reject and the other minor revision, we suggest the SE seek a third reviewer to conduct an appraisal on the **contentious issue(s)** and that the SE contact the third reviewer directly and invite them formally on ScholarOne to ensure an acceptable turn-around time.
- When there are difficulties finding reviewers, we recommend the SE is the second reviewer and continue searching for one reviewer.

If the manuscript has received one reviewer's comments and there is difficulty finding another (affecting turn-around-times) the SE must decide **on how to progress the manuscript** on a case-by-case basis. To progress with just one reviewer's comments, please ensure you have used all options - S1 searches, Reviewer Locator Tools, and your own network of contacts. If there is still only one reviewer's comments, please progress the manuscript with one review by changing the progress box from '2' to '1'. Do this in communication with the EA. Details on how to use ScholarOne search functions as well as organising alternate reviewers are in the SE [ScholarOne Guide document](#).

SE Recommendation

SE's must ensure papers are not accepted due to soft, casual or superficial reviews.

Confidential Comments to the Editor in Chief (EIC)

The system prompts you to enter any confidential comments you have. They can only be seen by the EIC, and are a helpful mechanism to give important information to the EIC without being seen by the author/s.

Comments to the Author

The system prompts you to enter comments to the author(s) so they understand an editorial decision and help them write a revision. SEs must use this section to synthesise reviewer comments and add any extra comments they have.

Please use the comment boxes as you see fit e.g. if reviewers have recommended to accept the article but you are still unsure of certain aspects you can summarise this in the EIC comments, even ask a question if unsure around the significance of your concern **and** then give a more detailed outline in the comments to authors.

Revised Manuscripts

Revised submissions must be re-read as a new document – as unchanged sections may be out of context when read alongside the revised sections. The revised sections must not be read alone.

Revised manuscripts are assigned to the original SE. The processes below are specific to ANZ J Surgery:

Minor Revision - the paper will be sent directly to you for your recommendation.

Major Revision –the EA will send the paper to the original reviewers to re-review.

If the manuscript needed a major revision and the original reviewer(s) is unavailable, declined the invitation or the invitation lapsed the EA will ask you if you want to either review the manuscript yourself or search for more reviewers. This is your decision.

If inviting new reviewers to review a revision, please add this text (or similar) in the invitation email:

Unfortunately, an original reviewer cannot now review this revised submission. As I think further review is needed, I am inviting you to review this revised manuscript.

You can view the previous reviewer's comments in the author(s) response letter; you have access to the decision letter in your reviewer centre.