

COUNCIL PAPER 14092022-10 ME Constituency Report Addendum

- As a CRG we have been invited to participate in a number of Discussions relating to new title proposals. The info we receive has so far been completed Expression of Interest forms. The info in this form is insufficient to judge whether the proposal is important/priority and whether the title should be registered. The proposals we have seen do not state whether the authors plan to perform an intervention review or other type of review. It has not always been clear from the text. So while a topic may be important, the proposal itself is not necessarily sufficiently clear to judge whether the title should be registered. Also, there is no info on the experience of the author team, previously a key consideration. I am at a loss why the well-established title proposal forms are no longer used in first instance.
- As a CRG we are not taking on new titles; we are happy to contribute by indicating whether a topic is important or not. However, the responses from the Proposal Manager seem to suggest that it is up to the (outgoing) CRG to decide whether a title should be registered, surely this ultimately the responsibility of central Cochrane?
- What will happen with Proposal Manager Invitations after March 2023 when many CRGs are dissolved? Will existing Coordinating Editors continue to be selected for their opinion?
- In our CRG, the length of time from approval by the Coordinating Editor to publication is now a minimum of 8 weeks. If this does not improve drastically and quickly, we will miss the minimum annual number of publications required by our funder due to no fault of our own. It is disappointing that after years of being told that editorial bases are too slow, it now appears acceptable that the final stage carried out by central Cochrane takes significantly longer than it has ever done.
- The very long production phase makes handover planning for CRGs that will cease to exist in March 2023 very difficult.
- We have resorted to inviting peer reviewers out with EM to ensure they receive our invitations to peer review. While this is not different from what we used to do, we have noted that a number of our longstanding PRs are not willing to engage with EM and decline.
- Are there any plans to thank and celebrate our colleagues in the UK Groups who are losing their jobs? I am aware that other jobs are also being lost in other parts of the world but lack of communication with regard to these lost editorial bases means I am not sure who they are. They too should be celebrated. Can someone please let us know?
- What systems are in place regarding IS support for groups who have lost their IS and those who will lose this support over the next six months or so?