

TITLE REGISTRATION_ Text definition_MC,LD,NW

COCHRANE POLICY ON TITLE REGISTRATION:

The first step in the review process is to agree a review topic with the relevant Cochrane Review Group (CRG). A title will be registered, possibly after discussion among the CRG editors, and the review authors will be invited to submit a protocol.

Handbook 4.2.6 (Section 2.3.2)

TASK	Process	Sequencing	Task form	Cochrane resources
<p>Task 1: Expression of interest received</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the first point of contact between a CRG and a potential author. The expression of interest may be a phone call, an email or any other contact to indicate that an author is interested in writing a review on a particular topic. The specific review question to be covered may not yet be clear. When an expression of interest is received, the Process Owner creates a Vacant Title in Archie. In the Vacant Title Record, the Process Owner records the title, author(s), assigned Editor(s), etc. (if known). Person Records may have to be created in Archie for new authors. The Process owner then initiates the Title Registration workflow for the Vacant Title. The Process Owner records the date on which the expression of interest was received. Some proposed reviews may not proceed beyond the expression of interest, but it is important to record these events as part of the overall review process and workload on CRGs. 	<p>This is the beginning of the workflow.</p>	<p>System record date initiated. Record date expression of interest received.</p>	
<p>Task 2: Set deadline for registration or rejection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner sets the deadline for reaching a decision on the registration or rejection of the proposed Title. Archie will provide a default deadline of four weeks, but the Process Owner can select a different date if they choose. 	<p>This is a linear step.</p>	<p>Record deadline date. Default date may be overridden.</p>	
<p>Task 3: DECISION POINT Within scope?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner decides whether the proposed topic is appropriate for a Cochrane review, and falls generally within the scope of the CRG. Before answering "Yes", the Process Owner should be satisfied enough to request the formal submission of a Title Registration Form. If the proposed topic is not appropriate for a Cochrane review, or the topic falls clearly within the scope of another CRG, the Process Owner should answer "No". The Process Owner should record the reasons for their decision. 	<p>This is a linear step. If yes, proceed to Task 4. If no, skip to Task 15.</p>	<p>DECISION: Y/N System record date decision made. Record reasons.</p>	

<p>Task 4: Check for overlap</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlaps may occur within the scope of a CRG, or there may be overlaps where two or more CRGs have areas of common interest. • The Process Owner checks their own CRG records to identify any existing registered Titles, Protocols or Reviews with which the proposed Title could overlap. • The Process Owner may also be aware of areas of possible overlap with another CRG, or may choose to briefly search Archie or another CRG's module to confirm this. Archie will also automatically check for overlap when the Vacant Title is created at Task 1. • If a possible overlap is identified, this does not automatically mean the proposed Title will be rejected. The Process Owner will have the opportunity consult further with the author(s) of the proposed title, author(s) of possibly overlapping reviews, other individuals within the CRG, and other CRGs in later steps of the workflow. 	<p>This is a linear step.</p>	<p>System record date check conducted.</p>	<p>COCHRANE POLICY ON DUPLICATION OF REVIEWS AND PROTOCOLS On occasion, protocols and reviews may be being developed by groups of two or more authors concurrently but independently.... To help to avoid such duplication, titles of new reviews are registered in Archie. (the Collaboration's information management system). <i>Manual Issue 1, 2008 (Section 3.2.5.4)</i></p> <p>COCHRANE POLICY ON MANAGING AREAS OF COMMON INTEREST Different Cochrane Review Groups often have areas of interest in common.... For example, the treatment of neurocysticercosis is relevant both to the Infectious Diseases Group and to the Epilepsy Group. Such intersecting areas of interest need liaison between Cochrane Review Groups so that effort is not wasted in producing duplicate reviews, and opportunities for collaboration are grasped. <i>Manual Issue 1, 2008 (Section 3.2.3.6)</i></p>
<p>Task 5: Respond to author</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Process Owner sends a formal response to the author(s) regarding their proposed topic, usually by email, and requests the submission of a Title Registration Form (TRF). • The TRF ensures that they author(s) provide detailed information on the scope of the proposed review, the team of authors, and a commitment to publish the review in <i>The Cochrane Library</i>. • The Process Owner may take this opportunity to further clarify the scope of the proposed Title, to indicate areas of possible overlap that might affect the scope of the review, and to send information resources on writing a Cochrane review. 	<p>This is a linear step.</p>	<p>Record date response sent.</p>	<p>A good practice Title Registration Form is available from the CRG Resources Collection website: http://cochrane.org/crgprocedures.</p>
<p>Task 6: Title Registration Form submitted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author(s) submit a completed TRF. 	<p>This is a linear step.</p>	<p>Record date TRF submitted.</p>	
<p>Task 7: DECISION POINT TRF satisfactory?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Process Owner decides whether the TRF has been completed satisfactorily. • If the TRF is not satisfactory, the Process Owner may return to Task 5, requesting that he author(s) resubmit the TRF with changes. The TRF should record the reasons for their decision, including a brief description of the changes requested. • The Process Owner should upload the TRF to the CRG's documents folder in Archie. 	<p>This is a linear step. If yes, proceed to Task 8. If no, return to Task 5.</p>	<p>DECISION: Y/N System record date decision made. Record reasons. File uploaded to Archie.</p>	

<p>Task 8: DECISION POINT: Consult with others?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner decides whether to consult others before making a final decision about the proposed title. Within their own CRG, the Process Owner may wish to consult Editors, the TSC, etc. In cases of overlap, the Process Owner may wish to consult with the authors of other Reviews (published or in-progress), to determine the extent of overlap, negotiate the scope of the proposed Title, or identify opportunities for collaboration with the author(s) of the proposed Title. If the proposed Title falls in an area of shared interest with another CRG, the Process Owner should consult to negotiate the scope of the proposed Title, identify areas for collaboration between CRGs (e.g. joint responsibility or participation in the editorial process), or to arrange for the proposed Title to be transferred to the other CRG. 	<p>This is a linear step. If yes, proceed to Task 9. If no, skip to Task 10.</p>	<p>DECISION: Y/N System record date decision made.</p>	
<p>Task 9: Nominate people to consult</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner selects the people to be consulted about the proposed Title from Archie. At this stage in the process, these people should be selected from Archie. No new Person Records or Document Roles should generally be required. 	<p>This is a linear step. This Task only occurs if the Process Owner answers "yes" at Task 8.</p>	<p>Select referees. System record date selected.</p>	
<p>REFEREEING WORKFLOW TASKS</p>				<p>Refer to definitions for the Refereeing Workflow.</p>
<p>Task 10: DECISION POINT: Transfer Title to another CRG?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the Title falls outside of the scope of this CRG, or if agreement has been reached on an overlapping title, the Process Owner may decide to transfer the Title to another CRG. The Process Owner should have obtained the agreement of the alternative CRG before transferring the title. If the alternative CRG has not been contacted, the Process Owner should do so now, before completing this task. If agreement has been reached, this CRG may continue to collaborate on the proposed Title after the transfer. 	<p>This is a linear step that may follow Task 3, Task 8 or the Refereeing Workflow. If yes, proceed to Task 11. If no, skip to Task 13.</p>	<p>DECISION: Y/N System record date decision made.</p>	
<p>Task 11: Nominate new Process Owner</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner nominates which CRG the Title should be transferred to, and selects a new Process Owner to take responsibility for the Title. The Process Owner should send the TRF and any other relevant documentation to the new CRG. 	<p>This is a linear step. This Task only occurs if the Process Owner answers "yes" at Task 10.</p>	<p>Select new CRG and Process Owner. System record date selected.</p>	
<p>Task 12: New CRG creates Title</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nominated person at the proposed new CRG creates a new Vacant Title under the proposed new CRG. 	<p>This is a linear step. Proceed to Task 15.</p>	<p>Record date created.</p>	
<p>Task 13: DECISION POINT: Approve Title?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner decides whether to register or reject the proposed Title. The Process Owner should record reasons if deciding not to register the Title. 	<p>This is a linear step. This Task only occurs if the Process Owner answers "no" at Task 10. If yes, proceed to Task 14. If no, proceed to Task 15.</p>	<p>DECISION: Y/N System record date decision made. Record reasons.</p>	

<p>Task 14: Register Title</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner changes the stage of the Vacant Title to Registered Title in the General tab of the Document's Properties in Archie. The Process Owner can make any necessary changes to the Title at this point, such as changing the title wording, adding authors, etc. After the Title is registered, notification will be automatically sent to the Cochrane Newtitles email list. If the CRG includes titles in its Topics list, then topics should be assigned in the Topics Tab of the Document's Properties in Archie. 	<p>This is a linear step. This Task only occurs if the Process Owner answers "yes" at Task 13. This task ends the workflow. The Protocol Workflow will automatically begin.</p>	<p>Record date stage changed.</p>	<p>Sign up for the Newtitles email list at http://lists.cochrane.org/mailman/listinfo.</p>
<p>Task 15: Withdraw title</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner changes the status of the Title to Withdrawn in the Advanced tab of the Document Properties window in Archie. Reasons for rejecting the Title should be recorded in the Notes tab as an Administrative note. This will ensure that information on this decision is available to users with permission to read Administrative notes for the chosen entity, including Super Users and System Administrators, should a similar proposal be made in the future. 	<p>This is a linear step that may follow from Task 3, Task 12, or Task 13.</p>	<p>Record date withdrawn.</p>	
<p>Task 16: Notify author(s) of non-registration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Process Owner notifies the author(s) that the Title will not be registered, along with the reasons, or that the Title is being transferred to a new CRG. If transferring, contact details for the new CRG should be provided. 	<p>This is a linear step. This task ends the workflow.</p>	<p>Record date notified.</p>	<p>Refer to definitions for the Protocol Development Workflow.</p>

Notes:

- Decision points = you cannot proceed unless and until an editorial decision has been made
- [HB] means that this recommendation is taken from the handbook

Notes for the IMS Team

- We suggest a new category of title in Archie called something like "Preliminary Title" to use for this stage of the review process. Vacant Titles imply that there are currently no authors responsible for the title, which in the case of a Title Registration process is not the case.
- We suggest a default deadline for this process of four weeks.
- We suggest that there be a process for transferring ownership of a review from one Group to another. At the moment this is not possible in Archie: the old CRG must withdraw the title, and the new CRG creates it again from scratch.
- We suggest that the steps involved in transferring a review from one CRG to another could be created as a separate loop (like the refereeing loop) that could be initiated at any point in the review process (up to and including the update stage). The initiation of this loop should terminate any other workflow. For now, we have suggested two points in this process where these steps are accessed – after checking the initial relevance of the title, and after the refereeing process.
- At the moment, we understand that the only place for a Title Registration Form (or other document) to be uploaded into Archie is the CRG's file folder. We suggest it would be helpful if documents could be uploaded and attached to the Title's Properties, so that anyone with appropriate Document Roles (e.g. Editors or other referees) could access them without hunting through the list of all titles in the CRG's folder.
- We have added an extra step to nominate the people who should be consulted before initiating the referee process, as this cannot be automatically generated by Archie (e.g. if consulting another CRG or the authors of an overlapping review). In accordance with the last meeting of the Workflows Working Group, we have added this step here and not in the standard Refereeing Workflow (although the IMS might prefer the alternative option).
- We suggest that there be an option to cancel the workflow at any point in the process, deleting any remaining tasks and recording a reason.
- We suggest that it might be worthwhile to create a new category in Archie of "Rejected Title", as distinct from a Withdrawn Title.
- We suggest that the Protocol Development workflow could be automatically initiated at the end of this workflow.



