

IPAC'18 Scientific Publication Peer Review Process

Alex Bogacz

JLAB

SPMS module logic: stakeholders, deadlines

- Groups of people, Glossary:
 1. Peer Review Team PRT (IPAC'18 SPB, Chair + SPC, Chairs for IPAC'18, 19 and 20)
 2. EDITORS = MC Coordinators: 2 per MC (MC 'lead' + MC 'shadow')
 3. REVIEWERS
 4. REFEREES (a pool of volunteers)
 5. AUTHORS
- Software used: SPMS module
- Email: central ipac18 peer review account for reducing email to ipac18 accounts
- Deadlines involved:
 - 1) registration deadline
 - 2) submission deadline for refereed proceedings
 - 3) first review deadline
 - 4) correction deadline (authors must submit revised version if necessary)
 - 5) second review deadline
 - 6) final decision deadline (each paper either rejected or accepted by editors = MC coord.)
 - 7) start of JaCOW editing (peer review complete before)
 - 8) end of JaCOW editing
 - 9) reformatting deadline of peer-reviewed papers for publication
 - 10) submission deadline to refereed proceedings channel, e.g. IOP

SPMS module logic: Process I

- Step 1 - IPAC registration:
 - 1) AUTHORS: Ask at abstract submission, if an author intends to submit a paper for peer review
 - 2) REVIEWERS: Ask for peer review volunteers during registration. Volunteers register as REFEREES and confirm their professional experience beyond the highest university degree.
 - a) Required experience: Doctorate/2 years; Masters/4 years , Bachelor/6 years
 - b) SAB and SPC members are automatically included as REFEREES, ex-officio except, if they refuse
- Step 2 - between registration and peer-review submission deadline
 - 1) EDITORS: Review references of REFEREES – will qualify/reject them as REVIEWERS for their MC, if appropriate.
- Step 3 - peer-review submission deadline
 - 1) AUTHORS: submit papers early for peer-review - no extension of deadline to avoid delaying time critical review process

SPMS module logic: Process II

■ Step 4 - day 1 after peer-review submission deadline

- 1) EDITORS: trigger automatic SPMS assignment of papers with 2 REVIEWERS per paper
- 2) EDITORS: check (in SPMS) assignment and adjust, if necessary; goal: each REVIEWER has 2 papers to review.
- 3) EDITORS: final check (in SPMS) and granting approval of REVIEWERS for papers.
- 4) PRT: track (in SPMS) whether that step is timely and appropriately completed. If problems PRT will work with EDITORS to resolve.

■ Step 5 - day 3 after peer-review submission deadline

- 1) EDITORS: trigger information to REVIEWERS that they have review assignments in SPMS and ask them whether REVIEWERS cannot do review due to personal problems etc, reassign REVIEWERS if necessary (in SPMS).
- 2) REVIEWERS: work on reviews = download assigned paper from SPMS and review
- 3) EDITORS: send frequent reminders to REVIEWERS (in SPMS) making sure they can review papers

■ Step 6 - before first review deadline

- 1) PRT: review summary pages (in SPMS), monitor progress, follow up central email requests, distribute to EDITORS, AUTHORS, REVIEWERS

SPMS module logic: decision making tree I

■ Step 7 - at first review deadline

Case 1: two times green = automatic approval in SPMS

Case 2: one green, one yellow = PRT send email to all authors in this category with request to look at comments and improve paper, send new version for second review

Case 3: two yellow = PRT send email to all authors in this category with request to look at comments and improve paper, send new version for second review

Case 4: one green, one red = EDITORS: one of the two editors decides on reject/correct.
Can reassign reviewer, also to self

Case 5: one yellow, one red = EDITORS: one of the two editors decides on reject/correct.
Can reassign reviewer, also to self

Case 6: two red = rejected but reviewer can still reassign to new reviewers. EDITORS: check rejections.

Case 7: one green = EDITORS: assign new reviewer, editor can/should review self

Case 8: one yellow = EDITORS: assign new reviewer, editor can/should review self

Case 9: one red = EDITORS: assign new reviewer, editor can/should review self

EDITORS: handle emails to central peer review account; complaints about unjustified rejections (e.g. cases of rejection due to more than 3 pages with references on 4-th page)

PRT: advise EDITORS/REVIEWERS about problematic decisions and ask them to resolve

SPMS module logic: Process III

- Step 8 - after correction deadline
 - 1) REVIEWERS: download corrected paper from SPMS, work on the second review. REVIEWERS only assign 'green' or 'red', NO 'yellow' (since the second round of corrections has not concluded).

SPMS module logic: decision making tree II

- Step 9 - at second review deadline

Case 1: two times green = automatic approval in SPMS

Case 2: one green, one yellow = one of the two editors decides on reject/approve.

Case 3: two yellow = one of the two editors decides on reject/approve.

Case 4: one green, one red = one of the two editors decides on reject/approve.

Case 5: one yellow, one red = one of the two editors decides on reject/approve.

Case 6: two red = automatic rejection in SPMS

Case 7: one green = automatic approval in SPMS

Case 8: one yellow = one of the two editors decides on reject/approve

Case 9: one red = automatic rejection in SPMS

PRT: handle emails to central peer review account, in particular complaints about unjustified rejections (e.g. we had cases of rejection due to more than 3 pages length but only references on third page - this is allowed = mistake by reviewer), inform editors/reviewers about problematic decisions and ask them for follow-up (modify reviews or assign new reviews)

SPMS module logic: Process III

- Step 10 - enter JaCOW process
 - 1) all papers enter JaCOW process, JaCOW editors make sure content of approved papers stays unchanged, so reviewers can also check, JaCOW editors should improve references etc.
- Step 11 - after JaCOW process
 - 1) rejected papers: in principle, to be published in JaCOW only, with a stipulation from EDITORS to AUTHORS to withdraw the paper especially if Criterion 7 is not satisfied (final decision in AUTHOR's discretion).
 - 2) approved papers:
 - a) EDITORS: ask AUTHORS of accepted papers to reformat their final JaCOW version to required IOP form (IOP has one column rule, correct format of references, ...)
 - b) PRT: check that all papers are in order, assemble package and submit
 - c) publish in papers as preprints in JaCOW with tag to future IOP publication

SPMS module logic: Process IV

- SUGGESTED COMMUNICATION IMPROVEMENTS:
(per Ralph Assmann)

“For ipac17 we passed all communication between authors/reviewers/editors through the PRT. The only way of communication was as follows: reviewers and editors via review process to authors.

Request to pass info in the other direction had to go to PRT that then took action only, if the request was reasonable. This guaranteed full confidentiality, making sure that no delaying agreements are taken, to prevent ‘communication wars’ the between parties. It also minimized work for reviewers (you do your review and that's it) and put PRT in control.

On the other hand, it generates lot`s of work for PRT and restricts communication. It would be useful to create an automated channel for anonymous communication between the parties.”

Action Items

- Finalize 'White Paper' to IPAC'18 OC & SPC
 - SPB members should review the draft and have their comments ready via e-mail by Dec. 4
 - Final draft will be discussed at the next SPB Mtg.
- Next SPB Mtg. - a week of Dec. 11 (a Doodle Pole will be launched)