

## Meet the Editors

Eric Schneider and Jennifer Zelmer

## About Healthcare Policy/Politiques de santé

- **Focus:** research related to health policy development and decision making, e.g.
  - managing for quality and safety, governance and accountability, understanding and responding to public expectations, management of the healthcare workplace
- **Audience:** health system managers, practitioners, policy makers, educators and academics
- **Peer review process:** Considers both scientific quality of the work and contribution to knowledge that can inform health policy, planning and management

## Categories of Submissions

- Research papers
  - Up to 3000 words
- Knowledge translation, linkage, and exchange
- Data matters
  - Analyses of data that shed light on significant health services and policy issues
- Discussion and debate
- Health technology briefs
- (In English or in French)

## Submitting Papers

- **Choosing a journal**
  - Mandate, audience, past issues, instructions to authors
- **Preparing a manuscript**
  - Instructions for authors
  - Think about
    - What do we already know?
    - What does your paper add?
    - What are the evidence-based implications?
- **Submitting a manuscript**
  - Disclosures and related materials
  - Supplementary materials to assist reviewers and/or for publication as a web-based supplement
  - Expedited publication request (special circumstances)
  - Identify prior dissemination

## The Process at Our End

- Initial screening by Managing Editor
  - E.g. Fit with journal mandate, length
- Initial triage by Editor-in-Chief
- Assignment to Editor and selection of Reviewers
  - Considers areas of expertise, language, workload
  - Reviewers for our journal include academics and decision/policy-makers
    - Can suggest who not to use
- Decision by Editor-in-Chief based on recommendations from Editor and Reviewers
- Communication with authors

## Reviewing a Paper

- Volunteers welcome!
- But please turn down requests that:
  - May present an actual or perceived conflict of interest
  - Fall outside your area of expertise
  - You cannot complete on time
- (Suggesting alternative reviewers is very helpful!)

## About Good Reviews

- Constructive for both authors and editors
  - Indicates strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript
- Provides clear rationale for recommended decision
  - Separate out minor points (e.g. Editorial notes)
- Informs editors about any potential issues relevant to the manuscript
  - E.g. Questions about potential conflict of interest or gaps in reviewer expertise for certain aspects of the manuscript
- Editors will try to resolve significant conflicts among reviewers and/or identify which issues authors should focus on if a revise/resubmit is requested

## Revising and resubmitting

- Most papers that are eventually accepted go through at least one revise/resubmit cycle
  - Major vs. Minor
- Resubmission should clearly show how comments made were addressed (or if not why not)
  - Consider a summary table plus track changes
  - Warning: delays in revising and resubmitting are the longest stage in the publication process
- Will be reviewed by EIC/editor; may be sent for peer review again
- And then ...

## For more information

[www.longwoods.com](http://www.longwoods.com)