MedEdPORTAL IPE Associate Editor Responsibilities
Updated 02/27/19

Journal: *MedEdPORTAL* (www.mededportal.org)
Time Obligation & Term: 2-10 hours/month, 1 year term of appointment, renewable for up 1 two year
Immediate Contact: Managing Editor, Sara Hunt (shunt@aamc.org)
Secondary Contact: Senior Staff Editor, Hannah Kittel (hkittel@aamc.org)
Tertiary Contacts: Editor-in-Chief, Grace Huang (ghuang@bidmc.harvard.edu)
       IPEC Associate Director, Shelley McKearney (smckearney@aacnnursing.org)

Overview

From its inception, *MedEdPORTAL* was designed to serve as a prestigious peer reviewed publication for educators to receive recognition for their educational scholarship works and promote these works through worldwide dissemination. *MedEdPORTAL* has invested in the development of a rigorous peer review process that is aligned with standard industry practices for scholarly publications. Associate editors are an important component of the *MedEdPORTAL* peer review process. This document describes the expected duties of associate editors and provides important guidelines regarding the peer review process.

MedEdPORTAL Peer Review

Peer review is the attentive, unbiased scrutiny of submissions by invited expert reviewers and is the very foundation of scholarly publication. The peer review process should be characterized by collegiality, respect for the author, constructive criticism, and attention to the widely-accepted standards of scholarship. *MedEdPORTAL* Peer Review Guidelines were developed under the aegis of the *MedEdPORTAL* Editorial Board and are periodically revised.

Authors submit their resource to *MedEdPORTAL* through Editorial Manager, our peer review management system. Each submission is first screened by AAMC staff editors to ensure that it falls within our scope, meets minimal submission standards, and does not contain potential copyright and/or patient confidentiality violations. The staff editors work with authors to remedy minor omissions, but will reject submissions that require substantial revision in order to meet our submission standards. Upon successful completion of screening, the submission is assigned to the appropriate associate editor. The associate editor conducts a preliminary review of the materials to ensure the submission is ready for peer review and then selects at least of four reviewers with relevant expertise for reviewing the submission. The associate editor invites two reviewers at a time until two accept the invitation to review.

The assigned two reviewers then have three weeks to review the resource; they may issue one of the following decisions: *Accept, Revisions Required,* or *Reject*. Reviewers receive a reminder 1 week before their review is due, two days before it is due, and on the day it is due. If the reviewer does not return a review, another reviewer will need to be invited. After two completed and sufficient reviews have been submitted, the associate editor reads the completed reviews and rates them on a score of 1-100. If one or more of the received reviews proves to be inadequate or lack sufficient depth, the associate editor may: (1) return the review and ask for more detail, (2) choose to select an additional reviewer for the assignment, or (3) complete the review themselves.

The associate editor then composes a decision which includes both their own feedback for the authors, but also guides the authors as to how to address the reviewers' comments. The associate editor then indicates whether the submission should have an *Editor's Choice, Accept*, *Accept with Minor Revisions, Revisions Required, Reject*

with *Option to Resubmit,* or *Reject* editorial decision. The decision indication, associate editor decision, and reviewer comments are then sent to the editor-in-chief for consideration. The editor-in-chief makes the final editorial decision and sends a decision letter to the corresponding author with all comments appended. The associate editor is always copied on this letter.

Making Publication Decisions

The publication decision to accept or reject has broad implications for both authors and reviewers. *MedEdPORTAL* trusts the informed judgment of its reviewers and associate editors who are encouraged to employ their knowledge and experience within the context of the *MedEdPORTAL* mission to make publication decisions.

The publication decision-making process should be grounded in and informed by the *MedEdPORTAL* Submission Standards. Please ensure that the submission sufficiently addresses each of the standards as appropriate. Submissions may be rejected if one or more of these standards are insufficiently addressed.

Unlike traditional manuscripts that may be revised or modified with relative ease, certain *MedEdPORTAL* submissions (e.g., software programs, videos, etc.) may require substantial resources and effort to remedy a relatively trivial problem or abnormality. Associate editors must take into account these factors when issuing a *Revisions Required* decision. In contrast, undisputed biomedical errors should always be corrected before the material is published. The decision to *Reject with Option to Resubmit* may be issued when the resource is of potential interest for future publication but requires extensive revisions that cannot be accomplished in the short time allowed for a *Revisions Required* decision. Resources with serious flaws that cannot be remediated, components that are not within the scope of publication for *MedEdPORTAL*, or materials that have insufficient scholarly depth and breadth to warrant acceptance for publication may receive a *Reject* decision.

Truly exemplary submissions may be accepted as *Editor's Choice*. Less than 1% of *MedEdPORTAL Publications* submissions are awarded this distinction. The editor-in-chief will carefully consider all such decisions before issuing the final decision letter to the author.

Special Considerations for *Revisions Required, Reject with Option to Resubmit,* and *Reject* Decisions

Associate editors are asked to provide synthesized, summary comments to authors (and additional comments to the editor if they so choose). This should include a brief rationale for the decision. Keep in mind that authors are often keenly interested in clearly understanding the rationale behind editorial decisions. Our peer review management system provides an opportunity to provide such comments to authors. Please help the author understand which revisions are essential. Please note that in order to adhere to principles of scholarship, authors must convince readers that the work is additive to the current body of work in a particular area, that the work as presented will likely be used by others, and that there has been some evaluation of the work.

If a *Revisions Required* decision is made, authors are provided a reasonable amount of time to review their submission and make revisions as appropriate. The authors may elect to not change their submission based on one or more reviewer concerns/decisions but they must provide the rationale for their decision. Note that *MedEdPORTAL* reviewers are not typically asked to review resubmissions. After the author submits the revised resource(s), *MedEdPORTAL* staff will provide the associate editor with summary document explaining which revisions were made by the author. Associate editors are asked to carefully review this summary and any revised resources. Following this in-depth review, the associate editor will generate a secondary decision letter draft which is forwarded to the editor for a final publication decision.

Confidentiality and Submission Blinding

Authors and reviewers entrust *MedEdPORTAL* with their intellectual property. As such, their reputation and career may be affected by disclosure details prior to publication. Because of this, associate editors are asked to keep all informational components of the review process completely confidential.

Given the nature of the materials submitted to *MedEdPORTAL*, it is typically not feasible to mask the identity of the author(s). The names of reviewers will not be released to authors.

Conflict of Interest

Associate editors must disclose to the editor whether a conflict of interest exists that could bias their opinion of the material they are asked to consider. In such cases, they should excuse themselves from reviewing materials. Simply knowing one of the authors or having casual knowledge of the submitted resource does not necessarily mean that a conflict of interest exists. For questions regarding potential conflicts of interest, please contact *MedEdPORTAL* staff.

Associate editor Job Duties:

I. Processing Submissions

Associate editors are responsible for monitoring submissions through the entire peer review process by utilizing our online peer-review management system.

The following details the specific duties related to processing submissions:

Peer Reviewer Assignment
- After a brief evaluation of the submitted resource, select four qualified potential reviewers.
- Periodically monitor the progress of peer reviewer assignments to be sure each resource is accepted by two peer reviewers.
- Maintain an evolving understanding of the quantity and quality of the peer reviewer pool for the content area served by the associate editor.

Review Submission Content, Submission Form and Reviews
- Review submission content and submission form.
- Read completed reviews. If reviews are sufficient, draft a recommended editorial decision for the editor.
- If one or more reviews are insufficient, rescind the review back to the assigned reviewer and request additional details for the review, reassign the submission to a new reviewer, or independently complete a full review.

Revision Compilation and Assessment
- Review the staff-generated revisions summary to determine if changes and/or responses are adequate.
- Draft decision for submission and forward to the editor-in-chief to aid in final publication decision.

II. Recruiting Submissions

Associate editors are asked to assist *MedEdPORTAL* staff in recruiting submissions in their designated content area.

The following describes the types of resources appropriate for submission to *MedEdPORTAL*:

Desirable Qualities of MedEdPORTAL Submissions:
- High quality works that are in a form that other faculty can take and use/implement.
- Designed for and implemented with medical or dental trainees or practitioners.
- Submissions must address the recognized tenets of educational scholarship including clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

Desirable but NOT Required:
- Resources which are "innovative".
- Resources "proven" via outcomes-based research.

Examples of Materials which are NOT Suitable:
- Traditional articles/manuscripts that only describe an educational resource or topic.
- Static reference materials (e.g., online textbooks, pocket cards).

Associate editors are encouraged to periodically analyze the collection of resources in *MedEdPORTAL* to determine topics/concepts that should be actively pursued.

III. Recruiting Reviewers

While *MedEdPORTAL* maintains a large pool of reviewers, we are always interested in adding additional reviewers, particularly in many specialty areas.

Currently, the *MedEdPORTAL* peer review system maintains 1,800+ reviewers in its reviewer pool. Associate editors are welcome to select any of these reviewers. Please note that all reviewers are asked to read through the Reviewer Expectations before *MedEdPORTAL* staff will send them resources to review. To continually expand the *MedEdPORTAL* reviewer pool, associate editors may identify and nominate additional reviewers in their area of expertise.

Following a nomination, a prospective peer reviewer will receive an email invitation from *MedEdPORTAL* staff. Prospective reviewers are asked to create an account within our peer review management system, indicating the appropriate areas of expertise. Additionally, *MedEdPORTAL* asks that the reviewer also email mededportal@aamc.org the most up-to-date version of his or her resume. The *MedEdPORTAL* team will upload that document into the reviewer's account.

IV. Application Process
To apply, interested candidates must complete the online form at http://bit.ly/IPEAE19.

The submission cycle will close on Friday, April 5, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. Eastern.

The Associate Editor appointment will begin in summer 2019 with a one-year, renewable appointment.

Questions should be directed to Shelley McKearney at smckearney@aacnnursing.org.