

REFEREEING _ Text definition_FINAL

COCHRANE POLICY ON REFEREEING: <i>Prior to publication, all reviews must be refereed by at least two people external to the editor of the CRG.</i> Handbook 4.2.6 (Section 10.4.1)			
TASK	Process	Sequencing	CRG documents
Task 1: Referees access document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Workflow Manager should make the document available to the referees. This may be by the referees checking it out from Archie, or by sending an appropriate version, e.g. pdf, Word document, RevMan file or paper print. The document may be anonymised, if that is the CRG policy The Workflow Manager should also send appropriate documentation, including CRG guidelines, ad hoc instructions, a checklist, depending on the referee's experience level and preferences [HB]. The Workflow Manager must specify the date by which comments must be returned – normally within a month [HB]. 	Copies may go to all referees in parallel, if that is convenient to the editorial base.	A standard peer review checklist is currently under development by the CRG Procedures Collection Working Group. Examples of materials currently used by some CRGs are available at http://cochrane.org/crgprocedures .
Task 2: Write and submit comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The referee writes their comments and checks the document back into Archie, or returns them to the Workflow Manager. Comments may be within the document (e.g. track changes or marginal comments), comments within the pdf, as a separate free text document, or in an email. 		
Task 3: DECISION POINT: Are the comments satisfactory?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Workflow Manager checks that the comments are of acceptable content or structure. If the comments are considered unsatisfactory they must be returned to the referee for revision, and a new return date specified. The Workflow Manager may wish to leave the comments as they are, but provide feedback to the referee to guide future comments. <p>If there is no such policy within the CRG, this step can safely be skipped.</p>	If yes, proceed to Task 4. If no, return to Task 1.	
Task 4: Send comments to Editor for collation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Workflow Manager passes the returned (revised) comments to the designated Editor for collation. If the CRG has a single form to combine collated comments, this should also be provided to the Editor. <p>If collation is done by the Workflow Manager within the CRG, this step can safely be skipped.</p>		
Task 5: Collate comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments are assessed in accord with any CRG policy there may be on how to prepare and present them for the authors. Comments may be annotated, edited, tabulated, or left unmediated, depending on the CRG's policy. Comments may be collated on a standard form, or simply collected together to be sent as attachments to an email. Comments may be anonymised, if that is the CRG's policy. If the collation is done by someone outside the editorial base, the collated comments must be returned to the editorial base for checking. Unresolved differences between referee critiques may need to be referred for 		A standard editorial/peer review summary sheet is currently under development by the CRG Procedures Collection Working Group. Examples of materials currently used by some CRGs are available at http://cochrane.org/crgprocedures .

	arbitration to another referee or editor, or to the Co-ordinating Editor [HB].		
Task 6: DECISION POINT Have the comments been collated appropriately?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The Workflow Manager checks that the Editor has collated the comments appropriately, and returns them for clarification or correction if necessary. 	This task does not appear if Task 4 is skipped. If yes, proceed to Task 7. If no, return to Task 4.	
Task 7: Send collated comments to author	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The Workflow Manager sends the collated and approved comments to the contact person ◦ The editorial base may advise the contact person on how to respond to the comments. ◦ Even if no revision is required, the contact person should still be sent the comments, and should check out the document for final checking. - The contact person may provide comments to explain their response to the comments received. The CRG may provide a form for this purpose, and to ensure that all comments have been addressed. 		A standard review author editorial comment feedback form is currently under development by the CRG Procedures Collection Working Group. Examples of materials currently used by some CRGs are available at http://cochrane.org/crgprocedures .
Task 8: Author revises document and resubmits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Contact person, in consultation with co-authors and in line with editorial base guidance, revises document in response to the comments. ◦ The contact person checks the document back into Archie, and indicates which comments have been acted on, and why others were not acted upon. All comments must be accounted for. 		
Task 9: DECISION POINT: Does the document now adequately reflect the comments made ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The Workflow Manager checks that the authors have satisfactorily revised the document. ◦ If not, the contact person is asked to revisit the document, and a new due date agreed. ◦ The Workflow Manager must ensure that all referees have been accounted for, and that all refereeing contributions have been incorporated. <p>If all OK, the refereeing process is complete (Task 12 optional).</p>	If yes, proceed to Task 10. If no, return to Task 7. If Task 10 not needed, then the refereeing process is complete.	
Task 10: Check whether referee wishes to be acknowledged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The Workflow Manager should record the external referees' names in their module text under the appropriate section (Contributors) ◦ If the CRG routinely acknowledges external referees within the published document, the Workflow Manager should ask the referee to confirm in writing that they give their permission to be so named in the publication. <p>If the referee was already listed in the module text, and if the CRG does not acknowledge referees in the published document, this step can safely be skipped</p>	This can be done at any point prior to publication.	This step will be incorporated into the generic external referee invitation letter, under development within the CRG Procedures Collection

- [HB] means that this recommendation is taken from the handbook

