

The background features a large, faint watermark of the Hanyang University seal. The seal is circular and contains the text 'HANYANG UNIVERSITY' at the top, '한양' in the center, and '1939' at the bottom. The seal is surrounded by a decorative border of leaves and flowers.

“Train the reviewers”

한양대학교 구리병원 소화기내과

한 동 수



2010 KAMJE workshop 0330

Coping with peer rejection

Accounts of rejected Nobel-winning discoveries highlight the conservatism in science. Despite their historical misjudgements, journal editors can help, but above all, visionaries will need sheer persistence.

Not many people spend time in the world that they were in. Damadian and his colleagues considered that he hadn't won the Nobel and complained in full-page ads and other prominent newspaper advertisements that he should have. Lauterbur and Peter Mansfield received the Nobel for magnetic resonance imaging.

Whatever the merits of Damadian, the difficulties in assessing groundswell 30 years after the event, the opinion that arise over truly innovative ideas had a chance to consider its value. Journals and applications sent to the case, researchers can keep their fingers crossed. Rejections are predictable extensions of the process. If you would have it — maximizing the chances of publication in journals, they have no choice but to

Some funding agencies, to take a more age riskier, visionary applications. The US National Institutes of Health has a new roadmap that includes a Director's Challenge with precisely that aim. The European Commission is also setting up a

Regrets

What of the journals? *Nature*, while proud of its content over the years, has a confession to make about this year's medicine Nobels. Not so long ago, presciently pleased with having published Lauterbur's work, we celebrated it along with other *Nature* greats in a promotional campaign. Lauterbur politely wrote in to point out that we had published it only after he had appealed against a rejection.

In case anybody runs away with the idea that *Nature* is unusually culpable in this respect, they can look at a collection of rejections experienced by Nobel winners that neatly illustrates the hurdles they had to overcome to publish their work. Juan Miguel Campanario, a physicist at the University of Alcalá in Madrid, Spain, has compiled a list of more than 20 Nobel laureates' rejections by many journals, and recollections by many more of resistance by their peers (see www2.uah.es/jmc).

Not all of *Nature's* Nobel-winning casualties are totally embarrassing for us. Our notorious rejection of the Krebs cycle in 1937 is partly mitigated by the fact that we said we would publish it once several weeks' congestion was out of the way, only for Krebs to take it elsewhere. In some cases cited by Campanario, we are accused only of having the nerve to force the authors to shorten their papers.

However dubious, from the fact that they are but a minority in a substantial number of rejections.

The comfort from a little-celebrated journal, which is to champion submitted papers, and sometimes colleagues') resistance, according to his Nobel lecture, came from referees ("outraged enzymologists", who had used the idea that self-splicing RNA had been published it nevertheless.

Journal editors confirms that risk-taking and acceptance by editors persists — even if it is too early to say. Confidential, but papers in (for example) cell signalling networks, genetic linkage to the origin of life and extrasolar planets were accepted despite significant scepticism, and

Other examples, for instance in mammalian evolution and muscle crossbridge dynamics, were published with editors and referees suspecting that their conclusions were probably wrong but giving

편집인의 책임

- 학술지 질에 대한 책임
- 공정한 평가
- 윤리 기준
- 질관리

학술지 질의 유지

- 임상 및 과학관련 연구 보고를 향상시키기 위함
- 정확함, 타당성, 신뢰성
- 학술지의 목표와 범위를 따라야 함
- 내용에 대한 기준
 - “Is it true?”, “Is it new?”, “Will affect patient care?” –by Sox HC, ex-editor, Annal Intern Med.
- 교육자의 역할: 저자됨, 이해관계, 윤리를 교육

질관리

- 정정(Correction) or 오류(erratum)
- 논문취소(Retraction)
- Monitor peer review: review reviewers, process analysis

Conventional Peer Review

- One to three reviewers per manuscript
- Reviewers selected from database, organized by expertises
- Reviewers are not required to sign their reviews
- A time deadline for returning reviews
- Authors do not know reviewers' names and institutions
- Simple, general instructions to reviewers
- As reviewers to provide: Comments for authors, comments for editors, individual components and overall quality of the manuscript
- Reviewers are not paid for their work

편집인이 판단하는 심사의 질

- 심사를 철저히하고 이해하는 수준인 지?
- 시간의 적절함
- 저자에게 제시하는 적절한 근거를 가진 내용
- 건설적인 비평
- 객관성
- 원고 출판 여부에 대해서 편집자에게 명쾌한 설명

좋은 전문가심사자

- 40세 이하
- 우수한 기관 소속
- 통계나 역학에 대한 교육을 받은 사람

전문가심사를 의뢰할 때

- 정중하고 예의를 갖추는 것
- 전문가심사자에게 학술지의 목표, 심사기준을 알림
- 전문가심사자에게 서비스할 것
- 감사할 것
- 부적절한 전문심사자 배제
- 말이 안되면 심사하지 말 것

BMJ training package

- To inform participants on the state of peer review research
- To make clear what constitutes a good review
- To help participants understand what matters to editors about reviews
- To give participants help in producing a good review

BMJ 심사원칙

- Be courteous and constructive
- Remember you are advising us: we'll decide what to do
- The main aim of peer review is to improve what we publish
- Maintain confidentiality
- Declare competing interests (and send back your best friend's paper)
- Be timely (if you can't do it on time, say so)
- "Do as you would be done unto"

BMJ recommended review style

- **Importance of the work to general readers** - does this work matter to clinicians, patients, teachers or policy makers? Is a general journal the right place for it?
- **Originality** – does this work add enough to what is already in the published literature? If so what does it add?
- **Validity** of the research
- **Presentation** of the study
- **Ethical issues**

전문심사자 관리

- Feedback:
 - 상대방 전문가심사의 내용을 열람
 - 심사결과나 과정을 통지
- Art of reviewing
- 신중한 reviewer 선정
- 워크숍 등을 통한 Reviewer 교육
- Checklist
- Review 방법 개선: blind, open review
- 보상(돈/평점/감사의 글)

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
 6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
 7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
 8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
 9. Is the writing acceptable?
 Please make your review as follows:
 •Discretionary Revisions (wide)
 •Minor Essential Revisions (small)
 •Major Compulsory Revisions

	총심사 건수	2차 심사수	총심사 기간(일)	평균심사 기간(일)	편당심사 기간(일)	심사근거
1	2	2	115	38.3	28.7	39, 63
2	2		11	5.5		78, 91
3	3	2	70	23.3	7.2	18, 36, 78
4	1	1	31	31	15.5	20
5	3	3	86	28.6	12	25, 42, 81
6	3	3	140	46.6	17.6	30, 34, 53
7	3	3	45	15	7.5	15, 68, 89
8	5	5	216	43.2	16.8	3, 19, 23, 48, 54
9	3		56	18.6		16, 41, 47
10	4	1	93	23	17.5	8, 38, 51, 57
11	6	4	83	13.8	6.5	21,31,55,57,66,67
12	3	3	262	87	34.2	14, 37, 40
13	3	3	80	26.6	13.3	2, 29, 62
14	2	2	51	25.5	12.7	7, 50
15	1	1	49			
16	5	4	104	20.8	10.7	12, 26, 58, 66, 73
17	2	2	99	49.5	19.5	5, 56
18	1					
19	3	3	130	43.3	19.5	22, 33, 65
20	3	2	71	23.6	12	45, 76, 97
21	2	2	54	27	13.5	75, 93
22	4	4	105	26	8.7	9, 21, 24, 52
23	6	5	210	35	16.6	6,34,46,50,60,67

Gastroenterology considers the following article types: Case report, Database, Debate, Research, Software, Study protocol and Technical advance articles. The journal does not generally consider narrative review articles.

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
3. Are the data sound?
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
9. Is the writing acceptable?

Please make your review as **constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies** that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Seasons Greeting from Immunology

Dear Dr. Han

On behalf of the British Society for Immunology, The Editors and myself, I would like to thank you for your contribution as a valued Reviewer over the last year to Immunology. We wish you a Happy Festive Holiday period .

We wish you future success within your research areas and look forward to your continued contribution for the coming years.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Altmann

Professor, Editor-in-chief, Immunology

2010 KAMJE workshop 0330

대한방사선종양학회 워크숍 프로그램

2008.10.11

- 인사말
- 학회지 투고 규정 및 투고요령
- 논문작성법
- 휴식
- 논문심사 바르게 하기
- 출판윤리

대한대장항문학회 워크숍 프로그램

2005.6.25

- 의학연구 인용통계 정보에 대한 이해와 활용방안
- SCI저널선정기준과 JKMS의 SCI등재과정
- 휴식
- 대한소화기학회지의 현황과 미래
- 온라인 논문접수 및 심사제도
- 대한대장항문학회지 발전을 위한 제언
- 대장항문학회지 현주소 및 발전방향

Programme : International Forum on Academic Medical Publishing

Day 1 : Saturday, 7 November 2009

Friday, 6 November 2009

Time	Event	Speaker
8.30am – 9.00am	Registration	
9.00am – 9.45am	Opening Ceremony	Prof Wilfred CG Peh
	Welcome by President, APAME	Prof Chang-Kok Hahm
	Speech by Guest-of-Honour, Dean, Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School	Prof Ranga R Krishnan
	APAME-WPRIM: The Singapore Declaration on equitable access to health information in the Western Pacific Region	Prof Jeong-Wook Seo
9.45am – 10.15am	TEA BREAK	
10.15am – 12.30pm	Session 1: Issues from the Singapore Declaration	Moderators: Prof Chang-Kok Hahm/ Ms Merlita Opena
10.15am – 10.30am	Equitable access to quality health information: the WPRIM and GHIL initiatives	Mr Charles Raby
10.30am – 11.00am	Development of the WPRIM platform: Progress and update	Prof Dai Tao
11.00am – 11.15am	APAME: its role in improving the quality of scientific writing and publication in the region	Prof John Arokiasamy
11.15am – 11.30am	Exciting new ways medical libraries can facilitate the flow of information	Ms Nicola Foxlee
11.30am – 11.45am	Scholarly publishing in a paperless age	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
11.45am – 12.00pm	Marketing of medical journals: issues and challenges	Prof Jeong-Wook Seo
12.00pm – 12.30pm	Discussion	Panel of speakers

Time	Event	Speaker
8.30am – 9.00am	Registration	
9.00am – 9.15am	Welcome & Introduction to Workshop	Prof Wilfred Peh
9.15am – 9.30am	Why Write?	Prof John Arokiasamy
9.30am – 9.50am	Basic Structure and Types of Scientific Papers	Prof Wilfred Peh
9.50am – 10.00am	Preparing the Title, Title Page, Abstract and Keywords	Prof John Arokiasamy
10.00am – 10.15am	Writing the Introduction	Prof Saw Aik
10.15am – 10.45am	TEA BREAK	
10.45am – 11.05am	Writing the Materials and Methods	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
11.05am – 11.30am	Writing the Results and Discussion	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
11.30am – 11.45am	Preparing the References	Assoc Prof Hwang Nian Chih
11.45am – 12.05pm	Presentation of Statistical Results	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
12.05pm – 12.25pm	Preparing Effective Tables and Illustrations	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
12.25pm – 12.45pm	Preparing and Submitting your Manuscript	Prof Wilfred Peh
12.45pm – 2.00pm	LUNCH	
2.00pm – 2.45pm	Group Exercise 1	Profs Arokiasamy/ Peh/ Ng/ Saw/ Low/ Muttarak
2.45pm – 3.15pm	Group Presentation	Prof Wilfred Peh
3.15pm – 3.35pm	TEA BREAK	
3.35pm – 4.15pm	Group Exercise 2	Profs Arokiasamy/ Peh/ Ng/ Saw/ Low/ Muttarak
4.15pm – 4.45pm	Group Presentation	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
4.45pm – 5.00pm	Questions – and – Answers / Discussion	

Day 2 : Sunday, 8 November 2009

Time	Event	Speaker
2.00pm – 3.30pm	Session 2: Issues facing journals in the Asia-Pacific region	Moderators: Prof Jose Mario Avila/ Dr Badrakh Burmaajav
2.00pm – 2.15pm	Medical publishing in Korea: Lessons from the KoMCI and KAMJE experience	Prof Chang-Kok Hahm
2.15pm – 2.30pm	Current status of 129 journals published by member societies of JAMJE: Results from survey including those by KAMJE evaluation criteria	Mr Masamichi Kitagawa
2.30pm – 2.45pm	Challenges faced by medical journals in a large populous Asian country: India	Dr Kajal Krishna Banik
2.45pm – 3.00pm	Challenges faced by medical journals in a remote island state: Papua New Guinea	Ms Cynthea Leahy
3.00pm – 3.30pm	Discussion	Panel of speakers
3.30pm – 4.00pm	TEA BREAK	
4.00pm – 5.30pm	Session 3: Issues for editors and authors	Moderators: Prof Jeong-Wook Seo/ Dr Sea Hoong
4.00pm – 4.15pm	Editorial independence and the editor-owner relationship	Prof Jose Florencio Lapena
4.15pm – 4.30pm	Authorship problems faced by editors	Prof Jose Mario Avila
4.30pm – 4.45pm	Dealing with fraud and misconduct in research: Editor's viewpoint	Prof Looi Lai Meng
4.45pm – 5.00pm	Problem-based learning of publication ethics: The Japanese experience	Prof Kiyoshi Kitamura
5.00pm – 5.30pm	Discussion	Panel of speakers
5.30pm	Close of Forum	Prof Wilfred CG Peh / Prof Chang-Kok Hahm

Time	Event	Speaker
8.30am – 9.00am	Registration	
9.00am – 9.15am	Authorship and Acknowledgements	Prof Malai Muttarak
9.15am – 9.30am	Writing a Case Report	Assoc Prof Teo Eng Kiong
9.30am – 9.45am	Writing a Review Article	Prof Saw Aik
9.45am – 10.00am	Writing a Systemic Review	Dr Hsu Li Yang
10.00am – 10.15am	Writing an Invited Commentary	Prof Wilfred Peh
10.15am – 10.45am	TEA BREAK	
10.45am – 11.00am	Writing a Qualitative Paper	Prof Low Wah Yun
11.00am – 11.15am	Writing a Letter to the Editor	Dr Lawrence Ng
11.15am – 11.30am	How the Manuscript is Processed	Prof John Arokiasamy
11.30am – 11.50am	What the Reviewer and Editor looks for in a Manuscript	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
11.50am – 12.10pm	Dealing with Editor's and Reviewer's Comments	Prof Wilfred Peh
12.10am – 12.30pm	Electronic Publishing	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
12.30pm – 2.00pm	LUNCH	
2.00pm – 2.45pm	Group Exercise 3	Profs Arokiasamy/ Peh/ Ng/ Saw/ Low/ Muttarak
2.45pm – 3.15pm	Group Presentation	Prof Ng Kwan Hoong
3.15pm – 3.35pm	TEA BREAK	
3.35pm – 4.15pm	Group Exercise 4	Profs Arokiasamy/ Peh/ Ng/ Saw/ Low/ Muttarak
4.15pm – 4.45pm	Group Presentation	Prof John Arokiasamy
4.45pm – 5.00pm	Final Questions – and – Answers / Discussion	

전문심사자 교육프로그램 - 권장 -

- 통일양식
- 전문가심사
 - 배경
 - 의미
 - 방법
- 출판윤리
- 기타



2010 KAMJE workshop 0330