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Clinical Radiology: Who are we?

**Editorial Board**
- Us!
- Editor
- 3 Deputy Editors
- 53 Advisory Editors
- Uncounted numbers of reviewers...
- Authors

**Publisher Elsevier**
- Produces the printed journal
- Manages the on-line version
- Looks after the subscriptions
  - Individual
  - Institutional
  - On-line
- Helps with market analysis

**Editorial Office**
- Deal with the flow of papers
- Ensure the ‘Editorial Manager’ system runs
- Help the editors assign papers and manage paper to eventual acceptance or rejection
  - www.editorialmanager.com/crad/

**RCR**
- The ‘owners’
- Provides the MONEY
- Appoints the Editor
- Not involvement in running journal
Clinical Radiology

- RCR journal
- Fellows and trainees
- Scientific but also educational e.g. review articles
- Involvement of all RCR fellows important for success
Geographical distribution of corresponding authors of accepted articles 2016 ytd

- UK: 33%
- Australasia: 2%
- Eastern Europe: 1%
- South America: 2%
- Middle East: 4%
- North America: 12%
- Asia: 33%
- Western Europe (excl. UK): 13%
# Methods to help increase IF

- Solicit papers from highly-cited authors
- Identify highly-cited papers in your journal and related titles
- Identify zero-cited papers
- Review articles
- Special issues
- Speed of publication
- Online First
- Advertising, promotion, press releases, social media promotion
- Remind authors of relevant previous publications
Clinical Radiology: Impact Factor

Impact Factors of Selected Radiology Journals

- Radiology
- European Radiology
- European Journal of Radiology
- American Journal of Roentgenology
- Radiographics
- British Journal of Radiology
- Clinical Radiology

Bar chart showing Impact Factors from 2011 to 2015:
- 2011: 1.952
- 2012: 1.818
- 2013: 1.663
- 2014: 1.759
- 2015: 2.151
Clinical Radiology: Strategy
Commission: Commission: Commission

- **Virtual Special Issues:**
  - aim for 2/year
  - Breast
  - Radionuclide/PET CT
  - CT Dose Reduction published

- **Journal special issues:**
  - Nuclear Medicine & PET/CT, 4 articles, & latest PET CT Guidelines
  - Cardiovascular imaging, 8 articles
Clinical Radiology: Strategy

• **Individual commissioned articles:**
  Published; a number featuring Top 10 downloads & cites

• **Society and special interest group guidelines**
  BTS on pulmonary nodules
  RCR/RCP guidelines for PET/CT 2016
  Prostate MRI: Who when and how; report from a UK Consensus Meeting: 2013; in Top 10 cites last 2 years
  PIRADS
Future Special Issues

- Chest
- Interventional Oncology
- Head & Neck
- Non Invasive Angiography

More commissioned articles, VSI & Guidelines

Coming soon:
- Chest Pain
- Stroke Thrombectomy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol</th>
<th>Iss</th>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Downloads Jan-Apr 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review article</td>
<td>Acute pancreatitis: international classification and nomenclature</td>
<td>Bollen, T.L.</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review article</td>
<td>Digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT): a review of the evidence for use as a screening tool</td>
<td>Gilbert, F.J.; Tucker, L.; Young, K.C.</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Full length article</td>
<td>Nuclear medicine imaging of bone infections</td>
<td>Love, C.; Palestro, C.J.</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Full length article</td>
<td>Accuracy of radiographer plain radiograph reporting in clinical practice: a meta-analysis</td>
<td>Brealey, S.; Scally, A.; Hahn, S.; Thomas, N.; Godfrey, C.; Coomarasamy, A.</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review article</td>
<td>Texture analysis of medical images</td>
<td>Castellano, G.; Bonilha, L.; Li, L.M.; Cendes, F.</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review article</td>
<td>Imaging of neurosarcoidosis: common, uncommon, and rare</td>
<td>Bathla, G.; Singh, A.K.; Policeni, B.; Agarwal, A.; Case, B.</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review article</td>
<td>MRI technique for the preoperative evaluation of deep infiltrating endometriosis: current status and protocol recommendation</td>
<td>Schneider, C.; Oehmke, F.; Tinneberg, H.R.; Krombach, G.A.</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s in it for me?
- Up to date
- Efficient at appraising papers
- Know if clinicians are correct or not

Bring in additional resources
- Staff, equipment
- Soft money trials
- Govt. increase national funding

Why do research?
- Interest
- Challenge
- Envisage future career? academic
- ?journal involvement
- Encourages critical analysis of publications
- Increases knowledge of subject
- Improves job prospects
- Meet people out with department
- Less plain film reporting!!
- Encouraged by RCR curriculum
- Nice hotels & conferences
- Air miles
- Association with industry

Fun & interesting

Improve the service
- Evidence based radiology
- Don’t waste time & money on things that don’t work
- Manage clinicians requests effectively

Self interest
- Better job
- Better salary
- Job satisfaction
- Travelling/communicating with others
How to Review a Paper
Why I review papers

Basis of all scientific journals
Critical to journal success

Critical to scientific progress
Optimise results / discussion

You are the experts
If not you, then who?

Reviewing requires motivation:
Time
Intellectual effort
Subject matter expertise

Motivation
Keeps you up to date
Learning opportunity
Teaching opportunity

Juniors produce better reviews¹
1. Evans AT. J Gen Intern Med 1993;8;422-8
How to review a scientific paper

Overarching principles:
- Review papers within your sphere of expertise
- Don’t be too narrow
- Take the job seriously
- Consider it a compliment to be asked
- Reputation of the journal

A good review...
- Constructive, thoughtful, challenges
- Takes time and effort

A bad review...
- Superficial, picks faults, no justifications
- Lazy
How to review a scientific paper

Abstract
What is the essence of the paper?
What do I need to know?
What do the authors think is the message?

General Principles
Language
Is a language service needed prior to review?
Original idea vs ‘Me too’
How to review a scientific paper

Introduction
Background science
Rationale for the study
Why is this subject important?

Materials and Methods
Ethical approval
Could you replicate the study based on this?
Don’t make assumptions
Precise description

Materials and Methods
Is the methodology sound?
Could there be confounding factors?
All or selected patients?
Validated scoring systems?
How to review a scientific paper

Results
Are the results clear?
Do the results tell a story?
Do they answer the question posed?
Are the statistics comprehensible?
Do they add up?

Figures and Tables
Clear and uncluttered
No unnecessary data
Images should be clearly labelled and demonstrate the findings
How to review a scientific paper

Discussion
Do the authors conclusions reflect the results
Could the results be interpreted differently?
How does this add to / compare with known data in this field?

Discussion
If there is contradictory data, how do the authors explain this?
Do the authors address any potential methodological flaws?
Where next with the work?

References
Have the authors referenced any facts that they state?
Are there other key references the authors have omitted?
How to present your review

Summary
What do you understand as the message?
Is it original or ‘me too’?
Is the language satisfactory?
Abbreviations/ jargon
Is the paper overly long/ concise?

Section by section:
Ask for clarification where unclear
Ask the authors to provide more or less data
Challenge any conjecture or unfounded conclusions
How to present your review

Section by section:
Ask for clarification where unclear
Ask the authors to provide more or less data
Challenge any conjecture or unfounded conclusions

Please Don’t:
Tell the authors what to do/ write
Identify every grammatical error
Make recommendations for accept or reject in the body of the review
Recommend ‘a more specialised journal’
How to present your review

Please Don’t:
Tell the authors what to do/ write
Identify every grammatical error
Make recommendations for accept or reject in the body of the review
Recommend ‘a more specialised journal’

Ethical concerns
Was the study done without approval/ consent?

Plagiarism
Highly variable writing quality

Decision is sent to all reviewers
Together with reviewers/ editors comments
Read it- see what others thought

Different perspectives and insights

There is no right or wrong
It’s an opinion, all are valid
Feedback from the editors

Decision is sent to all reviewers
Together with reviewers/editors comments
Read it - see what others thought

Different perspectives and insights
There is no right or wrong
It’s an opinion, all are valid

Reviewing Revisions
Has the author answered your points?
Are there any further issues to clarify?
Does the paper now warrant publication?
You can still reject

Raising concerns
Dual submission
Simultaneous submission for publication
Same / different authors
Resubmission of published data

Inconsistent data
Have this group published before?
Are the numbers/outcomes different?

Email the Editorial team
Search the literature for matching text
Review other publications by the same group
Contact the authors
Contact other journal editors
Clinical Radiology: journal promotion

- Graphs
- **Virtual issue**
- Member website picture
- **My dashboard**
- Twitter – **Top downloads, cites, virtual special issues, 5000 followers**
- Social media
- Email campaigns – IF, open access, publication speeds, meetings e.g. ECR, RSNA, etc.
In 2016 we continue to provide further ways of enriching the user experience which will encourage members to access content on www.clinicalradiologyonline.net via the RCR website.

So far in 2016 we have used the enhanced features of the Journal’s member portal to:

- Publish our first podcast in May this year. Dr Mark Kon interviewed Professor Carl Roobottom and Mr Robert Loader at Derriford Hospital in Plymouth.
- Published our CT dose reduction virtual special issue.
- Highlight Editor’s choice articles, one per edition.
- Highlight the Journal’s new Impact Factor

The table below indicates the usage of the journal via this website for the years 2012 - April 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page views (hits)</td>
<td>135,215</td>
<td>264,872</td>
<td>357,645*</td>
<td>410,858</td>
<td>112,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total visits</td>
<td>35,371</td>
<td>93,591</td>
<td>135,449</td>
<td>166,440</td>
<td>52,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique visitors</td>
<td>29,729</td>
<td>81,490</td>
<td>120,667</td>
<td>148,482</td>
<td>47,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-text article downloads</td>
<td>16,196</td>
<td>19,489</td>
<td>23,140</td>
<td>25,442</td>
<td>15,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*March 2014 total page view data subject to inflation by web crawler. This 2014 figure includes an estimated total for March 2014.

Virtual Special Issues
Clinical Radiology’s special issues and virtual special issues give us an opportunity to showcase the very best commissioned research and comment in the field.

For the PET/CT and CT Dose Reduction Virtual issues we:

- Sent e-mails to our lists of opted in researchers
- Place banners such as those shown below on websites of related Elsevier titles
- Tweeted via the RCR and Elsevier twitter channels
- Link to the virtual special issue from the Journal’s homepage
Example:
## Accepted Papers by Article Type 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>Pending</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial or Commentary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Commentary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Reply to Letter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to the Editor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Paper</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictorial Review</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Article</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Issue Paper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good research: submit
Try Pictorial Review
What else have we done??

- Abstract publications of electronic only articles; started Easter 2016.
- Annual Editor’s Editorial in journal established. Also Newsletter article annually.
- Clinical Radiology sessions at ASM
- Established a more formalised system of article tracking for Special issues
- Annual CPD certificates for all reviewers, Advisory Editors, Deputy Editors and Editor.
- Encouraging Clinical Radiology citations.
- Currently running 2 Strategy meetings/year to help maintain momentum.
- Editorial Board meeting in June 2016 rather than linked to ASM.
- Recruitment is not easy.
- Try and establish closer links with RCR Committees and increase journal involvement

Addition of trainee to Advisory Board; responsible for Podcasts
Integrate the journal more into College life

Important across the age spectrum
Why not become a reviewer?
Workshops TODAY & next year
possibly one day meetings at RCR
Start early; encourage trainees
Closer relationship with JRF, Publications Comm, Research Comm, Special Interest Groups
Better communication
Website
Use of images stacks and videos to accompany pictorial reviews; teaching tool
Aims

• Development aims
  – Improve impact factors
  – Raise international profile and reputation
  – Maximise advantage gained from on-line developments
  – Increased engagement by the editorial and reviewing teams
Other considerations

- Paperless
  - Open access
  - 3D and image stacks on-line for articles
  - Change balance
    - Reviews/articles
    - Education/research
- Other journals
- New on-line initiatives and modes of publishing
- Lack of engagement
  - Loss of time
  - Disinterest

- Your say…
THE EDITOR'S PASSPORT

The Editor stood ’fore the Heavenly Gate,
His features pinched and cold.
He bowed before the Man of Fate,
Seeking admission to the fold.
“What have you done,” St. Peter asked,
“To gain admission here?”
“I was the Journal’s editor, Sir,
For many a weary year.”
The Pearly Gates swung open wide
as Peter pressed the bell.
“Come in and choose your harp,” he cried;
“You’ve had your share of hell!”