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Agenda

- Welcome and brief introduction to the project – Karla Soares-Weiser
- Update on project Workstream 1 – Rachel Marshall
- Update on project Workstream 2 – Ruth Foxlee
- Presentations from 3 members of the Cochrane community
- Question & Answer session – All panellists
- Wrap-up
Panel – Tues 22 June

Karla Soares-Weiser – Editor in Chief
Toby Lasserson – Deputy Editor in Chief
Ruth Foxlee – Senior Programme Manager, Editorial & Methods Dept
Vanessa Jordan – Author Rep, Cochrane Council; Assoc. Director, Cochrane New Zealand
Vanessa Piechotta – Managing Editor, Cochrane Haematology
Robert Boyle – Co-ordinating Editor, Cochrane Skin; Senior Editor, Children & Families and Mental Health & Neuroscience Networks
Panel – Thurs 24 June

Karla Soares-Weiser – Editor in Chief

Toby Lasserson – Deputy Editor in Chief


Ruth Foxlee – Senior Programme Manager, Editorial & Methods Dept

Rachel Plachcinski – Cochrane Consumers’ Executive

Roger Soll – Co-ordinating Editor, Cochrane Neonatal

Robert Boyle – Co-ordinating Editor, Cochrane Skin; Senior Editor, Children & Families and Mental Health & Neuroscience Networks
Q & A instructions

- Add questions to the Q&A panel on the right-hand navigation pane (please do not add questions to the chat section)
- Add questions to Q&A panel at any time during the session
- Vote for the questions you want to be answered at any time during the session
- Questions will be answered by panellists after presentations
- Written answers to all questions (including those not answered in the session) will be added to the Editorial Independence & Efficiency Project web page
Aims of this session

• To provide information about the project and answers to your questions
• To hear people’s thoughts on the future of producing reviews in Cochrane
Editorial Independence & Efficiency: Workstream 1 update

Rachel Marshall
Editorial Lead, Editorial & Methods Department
June 2021

Trusted evidence.
Informed decisions.
Better health.
## Progress to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project plan approved by the Cochrane Governing Board</td>
<td>March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plan posted on the project web page</td>
<td>March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group (supporting workstream 1) agreed</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback received from Cochrane Council and Managing Editors, as well as individual Cochrane members</td>
<td>Ongoing – meeting with ME Exec in April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of Managing Editors to the Central Editorial Service</td>
<td>March/April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Cochrane Review Groups involved in phase A of the pilot agreed</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Progress to date...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three meetings of the Working Group</td>
<td>May/June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Living’ process document for pilot groups</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Q&amp;A sessions with pilot groups</td>
<td>May/June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for submission to Central Editorial Service</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for pilot groups moving to Editorial Manager</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working Group discussion points

- Peer review
- Minimising duplication of effort between CRG and Central Editorial Service
- Using CRG content knowledge expertise
- Criteria for submission to Editorial Service
- Managing ‘poor quality’ submissions to Editorial Service
- Timelines for editorial process
- Handling feedback, amendments and withdrawals
- Development of reviews
- Metrics for evaluation
- Deciding to move to the next phase of the pilot
- Copyediting
- Adjustments to the editorial process for specific review types
Listening to feedback...

Themes in feedback:

• Why do this?
• Why now?
• Why this model?
• How will people be included?
• Who will do what in the pilot?
• What is in it for CRGs that don’t have issues of independence or efficiency?
• How will jobs be affected?
• What are the longer term plans for the pilot?
Why this model for the pilot: independence?

Other options considered:

- CRGs perform development function and Networks perform editorial function
- Define development and editorial roles internally within CRGs
- CRGs perform only editorial function and don’t support authors in development
Why this model for the pilot: efficiency?

Poor-quality submissions

Issues/alternatives raised in feedback…

• Author support tools
• Training
• Reduce length and complexity of reviews

Cochrane Review Groups and Managing Editors are left to sort out poor-quality submissions…
Who will do what in the pilot? Editorial service

1. Submission check (COI, plagiarism etc) 1 - 5 days
2. Decision: 1) Take forward? 2) Sequential or parallel review? 1 - 1.5 weeks
3. Methods review 2 - 3 weeks
4. Assess reviewer comments, editorial decision, guidance 1 - 2 weeks
5. Authors revise 3 weeks
6. Assess author revisions 1 - 2 weeks
7. Edit 1 - 2 weeks
8. Sign off 1 week
9. Copy-editing 3 weeks (inc author approval)
Who will do what in the pilot?

CRGs

- Managing portfolio of reviews (prioritising topics for new reviews; prioritising which reviews to update)
- Supporting authors (checking drafts, editing drafts, commissioning and/or connecting teams/mentors, supporting revisions and responses to reviewers)
- Producing reviews (authoring)
- Project management (timings of submissions, co-ordinating input to drafts, managing relationships with commissioners and funders, managing relationships with systematic reviewers)
- Recommending peer reviewers
- Knowledge translation and stakeholder engagement
What is in it for CRGs that don’t have issues of independence or efficiency?

• We’re all ‘Cochrane’
• Remove burden of conflicting development and editorial functions
• Opportunities for CRG members to become authors and credited for their work
• Policy, guidance, training and systems more tailored to functions
• New opportunities for funding and collaboration
Editorial Independence & Efficiency: Workstream 2 update

Ruth Foxlee
Senior Programme Manager, Editorial & Methods Department
June 2021

Trusted evidence.
Informed decisions.
Better health.
An evolving project

- Rapidly changing landscape - research funding and publishing
- Rethinking our model for producing Cochrane Reviews
- Need for change management expertise
- Revised consultation plan
Revising the consultation plan

Initial plan:
- Meet with all CRGs individually in 2021
- Focus on CRGs not other Cochrane groups

Challenging process in a rapidly changing environment

Revised our plan to listen to a wide range of Cochrane voices, quicker
New consultation plan – 3 phases

Series of 1-2-1 meetings with subset of CRGs – various countries, networks, topic areas and levels/sources of funding, number of staff, etc. (approx. 25% of CRGs) is underway

Workshops with a number of Cochrane groups – CRG + other groups

Survey to reach the widest possible audience – including our external stakeholder?
Next steps

1. Complete 1-2-1 sessions
2. Meeting with Cochrane Council
3. Set dates for workshops
4. Define our process for presenting the information we gather
Continuing to evolve

- Programme vs. project?
  - Central Editorial Service Pilot – workstream well-defined & progressing
  - Consultation – phases 2 & 3 yet to be fully defined but progressing
  - Cochrane evidence synthesis model – work underway, linked to consultation process
  - Implications for preparing and publishing reviews – project not yet well-defined
Editorial Independence and Efficiency Project

Background
Project
Advisory Group
Workstream 1: Pilot project
Working Group
Workstream 2: Consultation
What’s next
FAQs

Cochrane is undertaking a project aiming to improve editorial independence and efficiency. There are two workstreams within the project – Workstream 1 Scaling up and piloting a Central Editorial Service and Workstream 2 Consultation with all CRGs on the future of producing reviews in Cochrane. Full details of the project are included on this page. If you have any questions on the below, please use this query form.
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