

Feedback workflow_Text definition_V4

COCHRANE POLICY ON FEEDBACK

Feedback Editors are necessary to fulfill The Cochrane Collaboration's policy that all Authors with reviews or protocols in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews should respond to user feedback.

It is essential that efficient arrangements are available for amending reviews in the light of new evidence and valid feedback. To achieve this, The Cochrane Collaboration's working methods include a commitment to timely updating and concurrent reporting of feedback and other responses. Source Cochrane Manual, Issue 2, 2008 [updated 21 February 2008] (Section 2.2.5.3)

PRINCIPLES

1. All CRGs should, ideally, have a named Feedback Editor (FE) who does not hold another role with the editorial Group that could be perceived as a possible conflict of interest. This person cannot be the FE for a review for which they are either an author or contact editor.
2. FE's role is to communicate with the submitter and then the contact person for the review before it is submitted for editorial approval, i.e. the FE is the Workflow Manager for the Feedback Workflow. Once the FE has agreed the feedback to be published and the author's reply, the review is submitted for editorial approval and the Amended or Update review Workflow, for which the RGC is the Workflow Manager, begins.

TASK	Process	Sequencing	Task form	Cochrane resources
Precondition: User submits feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User submits feedback on a published protocol or review via the on-line Cochrane Library. Wiley staff check the feedback to ensure that it meets house rules, and contains no offensive language or libel. cochrane_feedback@wiley.co.uk notifies RGC and CRG's Feedback Editor (FE) of the feedback. 		NONE	See Cochrane Manual, Issue 2, 2008 [updated 21 February 2008] (Section 2.2.5.4): http://cochrane.org/admin/manual.htm
Task 1: Notification of feedback is sent to FE and RGC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FE receives a copy of the feedback The RGC receives a copy for information 	This is the beginning of the workflow.	System record date feedback received.	Note: RGC should change phase of commented review to editorial
Task 2: DECISION POINT Is the feedback minor or substantive?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor feedback comprises typographical error, spelling mistake or punctuation error Substantive feedback: any other 	If minor, proceed to Task 3 If substantive, proceed to Task 5	DECISION: Y/N Record reasons	
Task 3: IF MINOR review is corrected at Editorial base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FE asks RGC to check out review and make editorial correction 		System record date passed to Ed base for correction/task assigned to RGC	
Task 4: RGC corrects review and republishes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RGC corrects review RGC marks corrected review for publication FE notifies contact person that review has been corrected 	This is the end of the workflow for which the FE is the Workflow Manager if feedback is MINOR	System record date review is corrected and marked for re-publication	
Task 5: FE to edit feedback as necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FE should edit the feedback as necessary for clarity; any personal comments should be deleted 			Note: Feedback is not edited according to the Cochrane Style Guide: http://www.cochrane.org/style/csg.htm

Task 6: DECISION POINT Is clarification required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is clarification of feedback required from submitter of feedback? 	If YES, proceed to Task 7 If NO, proceed to Task 8	DECISION: Y/N Record reasons	
Task 7: FE to contact submitter of feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FE seeks clarification from submitter of feedback 		System record date submitter contacted System record date clarification required by	
Task 8: FE pastes feedback into review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FE pastes the feedback into the Feedback section of the review in RevMan and records the event in the What's New section 		System record date feedback added	
Task 9: FE notifies the contact person of the review and negotiates a reply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FE should contact the contact person of the review or protocol to inform them that the feedback has been added to the review FE explains role of FE FE invites the contact person to reply by checking out the review from Archie and inserting a reply, then checking the review back into Archie for sign off by the FE. The FE should provide guidance to the contact person about how to reply Inform the contact person that the feedback will be published in issue x of the Cochrane Library If feedback is published without a full reply from the review team, text should be added to the reply to say when the review team will respond 		System record date contact person was contacted and due date for reply	
Task 10: Contact person adds reply and submits review for editorial approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact person should check out review, insert reply and check review back into Archie for editorial approval by the FE. 		System record date review checked in for FE approval	
Task 11: DECISION POINT Has contact person addressed all points raised by feedback?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FE to check that contact person has addressed all salient points raised by feedback 	If YES, proceed to Task 12 If NO, go back to Task 9	DECISION: Y/N Record reasons System record date contact person was asked to revise reply and due date for revised reply	
Task 12: DECISION POINT Does the review need to be updated immediately?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FE to decide if the review needs to be updated immediately 	If YES, proceed to Amendment/Update workflow If NO, go to Task 13		
Task 13: RGC corrects review and republishes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FE pastes the reply into the Feedback section of the review in RevMan and records the event in the What's New section RGC marks corrected review for publication 	This is the end of the workflow	System record date reply added System record date review is marked for republication	
REVIEW/PROTOCOL AMENDMENT/UPDATE WORKFLOW				Refer to definitions in the Amendment/Update Workflow

Notes:

Note Task 7 : We suggest that when the FE pastes feedback into the review and checks the review back in Archie, the FE will be given the option in the workflow to change the phase from Editorial to Authoring (to allow contact person to read and check out the review to add a reply)

Note Task 8: We suggest that another check-in box is added to the check-in Wizard in RevMan 5, i.e. check in for Feedback Editor approval

Note Task 9: We suggest that another check-in box is added to the check-in Wizard in RevMan 5, i.e. check in for Feedback Editor approval

- Decision points = you cannot proceed unless and until an editorial decision has been made
- [HB] means that this recommendation is taken from the handbook
- FMAG documentation is unclear as to whether feedback and reply can be published without an amendment/update - assumption made that this is possible: some CRGs do this. **It should be possible to publish feedback and a reply without an update or an amendment to the review**
- Feedback documentation is unclear as to whether feedback should only be published with a reply - some CRGs publish feedback without replies. **Suggest that if feedback is published without a full reply from the review team that text is added to the reply to say when the review team will respond**