Meet the Editors/Associate Editors

Professors Paul Barron, Paul Lynch & Maura Sheehan

Edinburgh Napier Business School

Session Overview

- Role of the Editor, Associate Editor(s) & Editorial Board

- Important to 'meet the Editor(s)', also AEs – former is the 'gatekeeper'

- Engage with Editor prior to submission!

- R&R is GOOD!

- Examples – Editor & Reviewer reports and Author(s)' responses for 3* & 4*

What are Editor's Key Responsibilities?
https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/

- Editors have responsibilities toward the **authors** who provide the content of the journals, the **peer reviewers** who comment on the suitability of manuscripts for publication, the **journal's readers** and the **scientific community**, the **owners/publishers of the journals**, and the **public as a whole**.

Role of an Editor, continued

Depending upon the relationship between the editor and publisher for particular journals, some of the roles and responsibilities between the two may overlap in some of the following ways, in relation to authors:

- Providing guidelines to authors for preparing and submitting manuscripts
- Providing a clear statement of the Journal's policies on authorship criteria
- **Treating all authors with fairness, courtesy, objectivity, honesty, and transparency**
- Establishing and defining policies on conflicts of interest for *all* involved in the publication process, including editors, staff (e.g., editorial and sales), authors, and reviewers

Role of an Editor, continued

- **Protecting the confidentiality of every author's work**
- Establishing a system for effective and **rapid** peer review
- Making editorial decisions with reasonable speed and communicating them in a clear and constructive manner
- Being vigilant in avoiding the possibility of editors and/or referees delaying a manuscript for suspect reasons
- Establishing clear guidelines for authors regarding acceptable practices for sharing experimental materials and information, particularly those required to replicate the research, before and after publication

Role of an Editor, continued

- Establishing a procedure for reconsidering editorial decisions – rare!

- Describing, implementing, and regularly reviewing policies for handling ethical issues and allegations or findings of misconduct by authors and anyone involved in the peer review process

- **Informing authors of solicited manuscripts that the submission will be evaluated according to the journal's standard procedures or outlining the decision-making process if it differs from those procedures**

- Developing mechanisms, in cooperation with the publisher, to ensure timely publication of accepted manuscripts

- Clearly communicating all other editorial policies and standards

The journal hierarchy

- The Editor is generally supported by several Associate Editors & an Editorial Board (normally expected to do 1-2 review per annum for the journal).

- If an ECR, important that you (a) agree to do reviews for ABS ranked journals (get mentoring for your early reviewer reports!); (b) start to look for Board opportunities & (c) start to work your 'way up'. Target highest quality journals, feasible.

- Conferences provide critical networking opportunities both for you to seek reviewing and editorial roles and to meet the editor(s).

Value of 'Meeting the editor(s)'

- Inform her/him of research that you are doing – trying to establish if interest/a good fit (not always transparent from the published aims and objectives of the journal – there may be subtle biases toward quant. or qual. work, for example, by an editor).

- If interested, ask if she/he would like to/be willing to have a quick look at manuscript before you formally submit.

- This does NOT mean article will be accepted but enables you to 'craft' manuscript based on feedback; reduces chance of desk reject (weeks wasted).

Revise and Resubmit (R&R)/Fully Revise and Resubmit

- If you have it to R&R, may be useful to re-engage with the editor, before you start the revisions to ask for further elaboration/clarification of points raised in the editor's decision letter – only seek clarification on points the editor raises NOT the reviewers!

- Editor's will sometimes invite the author to email him/her in the decision letter, if any questions (see PL's example).

Revise and Resubmit (R&R)/Fully Revise and Resubmit

- These are GREAT, especially with 3* and 4* - the door is still open for you!

- You must meet the deadline, however and if you are unable to do so, write to the editor immediately and ask for a realistic extension (probably would not ask for more than a month).

- At this stage the editor and reviewers have all made a significant investment in your manuscript & all hope that you will diligently address the feedback and get to the next round (2 – 3 rounds are norm in 3* and 4* journals with each round now taking 3-6 months; gets longer closer to the REF).

- MS and PL will now share with you examples of editor letters and reviewer reports and how they responded to the feedback (including how to **politely** disagree with a reviewer's comment) for a 3* (relatively painless one) and 4* journal respectively.

Examples (3*)

When you cannot address a Reviewer's comment due to study design, data constraints

see Reviewer 1, 3*, point 2 (two groups of line manager….)

Add all suggested references by reviewers – even in not directly relevant see Reviewer 2, 3*, point 19.

Sheehan et al. (2018): Gaps (3*)

There are two important gaps that this paper addresses (see pp. 2-3).

"… an important **first contribution** to this paper is to investigate the intended-implemented gap in the context of an under-researched HR practice domain – anti-bullying workplace practices – and whether it acts as a mediator of the workplace bullying-outcomes relationship….

Therefore, the **second contribution** of this paper is to investigate whether targeted anti-bullying training for line managers will impact employee perceptions of the effectiveness of **implementation** of anti-bullying practices. We therefore shed light on an important boundary condition [*moderator*] that constrains the mediated relationship…"

Sheehan et al. (2018): Gaps (3*)

There are two important gaps that this paper addresses (see pp. 2-3).

"… an important **first contribution** to this paper is to investigate the intended-implemented gap in the context of an under-researched HR practice domain – anti-bullying workplace practices – and whether it acts as a mediator of the workplace bullying-outcomes relationship….

Therefore, the **second contribution** of this paper is to investigate whether targeted anti-bullying training for line managers will impact employee perceptions of the effectiveness of **implementation** of anti-bullying practices. We therefore shed light on an important boundary condition [*moderator*] that constrains the mediated relationship…"

Sheehan et al. (2018): Gaps (3*)

There are two important gaps that this paper addresses (see pp. 2-3).

"… an important **first contribution** to this paper is to investigate the intended-implemented gap in the context of an under-researched HR practice domain – anti-bullying workplace practices – and whether it acts as a mediator of the workplace bullying-outcomes relationship….

Therefore, the **second contribution** of this paper is to investigate whether targeted anti-bullying training for line managers will impact employee perceptions of the effectiveness of **implementation** of anti-bullying practices. We therefore shed light on an important boundary condition [*moderator*] that constrains the mediated relationship…"

Sheehan et al. (2018): Gaps (3*)

There are two important gaps that this paper addresses (see pp. 2-3).

"… an important **first contribution** to this paper is to investigate the intended-implemented gap in the context of an under-researched HR practice domain – anti-bullying workplace practices – and whether it acts as a mediator of the workplace bullying-outcomes relationship….

Therefore, the **second contribution** of this paper is to investigate whether targeted anti-bullying training for line managers will impact employee perceptions of the effectiveness of **implementation** of anti-bullying practices. We therefore shed light on an important boundary condition [*moderator*] that constrains the mediated relationship…"

Thank you

Questions please