

JBJS Essential Surgical Techniques Peer Review Process

Revised October 10, 2013

Providing confidential quality reviews that are useful to authors and editors is critical to ensure that *JBJS Essential Surgical Techniques* continues to serve the orthopaedic community as the premier online orthopaedic techniques journal. This document describes the peer review process at *JBJS Essential Surgical Techniques*.

Overview

The surgical technique articles presented in *JBJS Essential Surgical Techniques* are based on clinical studies that have been previously published or accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. As a result, all techniques published in *JBJS Essential Surgical Techniques* are supported by outcomes that are verified by the peer review process. *JBJS Essential Surgical Techniques* does not publish "stand-alone" technique articles.

All submissions to *JBJS Essential Surgical Techniques* undergo the peer review process and decisions regarding publication are made after the peer review process is completed.

Upon receipt of a submission, the Editor performs a cursory inspection and either 1) provides immediate feedback to the authors requesting changes prior to initiating peer review or, 2) assigns the manuscript to a Deputy or Associate Editor for handling, who then invites other Consultant Reviewers, or Guest Reviewers for confidential, blinded peer review. If the submission is based upon a procedure already published in The Journal, the same Deputy Editor is assigned. The handling Editor then forwards a recommendation to the Editor once the reviews are compiled.

Upon receipt of the recommendation, the Editor decides to (a) accept, (b) request revision, or (c) reject the manuscript. Revised submissions may go through the peer review process again until a final decision is reached. If there is a serious conflict among the reviewers' opinions, it will be resolved by the Editor, who may send the manuscript to additional reviewers.

General Considerations

1. Reviewers and authors are blinded from each other.
2. Reviews and manuscripts are confidential.
3. Reviews have 3 parts: standardized questions, a list of comments, and a recommendation grade.
4. Review timeline (15 days for initial submissions, 15 for revised submissions).
5. Feedback is provided to reviewers. Comments made by other consultant reviewers are posted for all reviewers to see once their own review is submitted. This improves reviewer performance. The Editor and the Deputy Editors evaluate consultant reviewers, and ratings are kept in a confidential database. Consultant Reviewers are graded on a scale of 0-100 and the grades reviewers receive are averaged for an overall grade. Reviewer status is evaluated with subsequent reviews, and can be lowered on the basis of the following factors: 1) does not respond to invitations to review; 2) declines the majority of invitations to review; 3) is late in providing a review; 4) fails to send in a review after accepting an invitation to review; 5) consistently returns an inadequate review; 6) provides a biased review that is not objective. Editors' notes regarding the reviewer's performance are made on their record in the database. Reviewers with consistently low scores are removed from the database.