OVERVIEW OF THE SECTION EDITOR CENTER

The Section Editor dashboard allows editors to take actions such as assigning reviewers as well as to track the progress of the reviews.

SECTION EDITOR ROLE

PSA recommends that Section Editors (SEs) should only review for experimental design, not for grammar or format. If the experimental design appears solid, SEs should select and assign reviewers for a more thorough peer review. If the experimental design is lacking, the SE should either instruct the Managing Editor to unsubmit the manuscript (returning it to draft stage) or contact the Editor-in-Chief to recommend rejection.

SECTION EDITOR VIEW

The Section Editor View of papers in process is broken out into actions; Select, Invite and Assign Reviewers. The Section Editor can all keep track of Reviewers who have not responded to being invited, as well as overdue reviews.

ACCESS MANUSCRIPTS VIA THE EDITOR LISTS

To view manuscript information, you may select any active hyperlink in the Editor Lists section of your dashboard.
Access Manuscripts via the Editor Lists

1. From the Editor dashboard, select any active link in the Editor Lists.
2. The View Manuscripts page displays a table containing any manuscripts in the selected status category. For example, if you clicked the link for **Select Reviewers** task, the table will display the Select Reviewers header and all manuscripts listed are in a status where the next step is to complete the Select Reviewers task.

![Select Reviewers Table]

3. Each manuscript listing displays the following:
   - **Manuscript ID**: A system-generated ID unique to the manuscript
   - **Manuscript Type**: Category of manuscript
   - **Manuscript Title**: The title of the manuscript and a link to view the submission
   - **Submitting Author**: Name of the submitting author, a button to view author details, and a hyperlink to send the author an e-mail
   - **Date Submitted**: Date of submission (or revision if viewing a revision)
   - **Status**: Status of the submission in the peer review process and the editorial staff assignments
• **Take Action**: A button which initiates the next action to be taken on the submission

4. You can sort the list by clicking on a (linked) column header.

5. Select an action from the **Take Action** button to access the Manuscript Details.

**SELECT, INVITE, AND ASSIGN REVIEWERS**

**OVERVIEW OF SELECT, INVITE AND ASSIGN REVIEWERS – SECTION EDITOR ROLE**

Here, the Section Editors select, invite and assign Reviewers.

- **Select** – is to create the pick list of reviewers who you would like to invite to review.

- **Invite** – is to send out the Invitations to the reviewers.

- **Assign** – is usually automated upon reviewer acceptance but can be completed manually by using the drop down selection.
About the Progress Indicator

Throughout the process of assigning reviewers, the progress indicator shows you exactly what is required for task completion and which steps have been completed. Typically, the number of reviews required to make a decision is an editable field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># reviews required to make decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># active selections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># returned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are unable to assign at least two reviewers in a timely manner, you can change the number of default reviews required by typing a different number in the field and clicking **Save**. For the sake of peer review integrity, this option should not be abused.

Bypassing the Peer Review Process

To bypass the review process entirely, change the **# reviews required to make decision** setting to 0. The manuscript moves to the next action task in the workflow — typically a Make Decision, Make Preliminary Decision, or Make Recommendation task.

Double-Queuing of Manuscript

Manuscripts can appear in two different queues in your Editor Lists section of your dashboard. This can occur if you have a required number of reviews and those reviews are in different stages.

In the example below, there are two required reviews, as indicated in the progress indicator on the Manuscript Details page. One reviewer has accepted and one has
declined. Since reviewer declined, the manuscript appears in the Select Reviewers queue. Since the other has accepted, but is overdue, the manuscript also appears in the Overdue Reviewer Scores queue.

While this is an accurate representation of the status of the paper, it may appear confusing when looking at the Editor Lists where you might count the manuscript twice. It will change if you invite additional reviewers and they accept, or if you do not wish to invite additional reviewers, you may reduce the number of required reviews in the progress indicator.

SELECTING A REVIEWER

Depending on how your site has been configured, you will have multiple ways to search the sites database for reviewers.

► Select Reviewers
1. From the Editor Lists section of the dashboard, click **Select Reviewers**.

2. The Select Reviewers screen displays. Click **Take Action**.

3. The Manuscript Details screen displays. In the Reviewer list section, it will indicate that no reviewers have been selected.

4. There are several options for locating a reviewer which are described in the **Reviewer Search Methods** section below. Search results will display.
5. Each name will have a magnifying glass in front of the name. Click the magnifying glass for more information about that person.
6. The Person Details displays in a new window. Statistics for the reviewer role will appear at the bottom of the screen if configured. There is also an **Add to List** icon on the screen, giving you a short cut to add the reviewer into your reviewer list. Close the window when finished.
7. Locate the reviewer(s) and click the Add checkbox next to the reviewer name.

8. Click the Add button at the bottom of the search results to add checked reviewers.

Reviewer Search Methods

There are several methods of finding a reviewer. Due to occasional difficulty in obtaining reliable reviews in a timely manner, PSA recommends trying all of them in order to cast the widest net possible. Each method is described below.

Author’s Recommended / Opposed Reviewers

This is a listing from the Author that they supplied during the submission process. The example below shows a recommended reviewer. If you wish to use this reviewer, click the Add checkbox, then the Add button.

If configured on your site, the institution of the preferred/non-preferred reviewer will be listed below the reviewer name. Also available if configured, you may click directly on the links to the external searches for Google and Web of Science to research the reviewer.
Quick Search

Search on first or last name, multiple people separated by a comma, or use an asterisk (*) to make the search a wildcard search.

The wildcard search is a technique that can be used to maximize your search results in the database. Wildcards are used in search terms to represent one or more other characters. An asterisk (*) may be used to specify any number of characters, typically used at the end of a root word (referred to as “truncation”). For example, searching for “educat*” would tell the database to look for all possible endings to that root. Results will include "educate," "educated," "education," "educational," or "educator."

Use at least 4 characters for quicker results. By default, the search only looks at users with a Reviewer role. If you wish to search other roles, select another role from the list.

Click the Search button.
If you wish to select a reviewer, click the **Add** checkbox, then the **Add** button.

Advanced Search Results

Search multiple fields such as institution or department. Wildcard searches can be used in this section. Look for the ability to search on **Person designations, flags, and badges**. You can also exclude institution and postal code. If you wish to select a reviewer, click the **Add** checkbox, then the **Add** button.
Conflict of Interest Alert

When using Advanced Search, you may see a conflict of interest alert appear next to a potential reviewer’s name. This appears when the reviewer and any of the authors listed on the paper share the same postal code or institution.

Adding New Reviewers

If the person you would like to have review the manuscript is not in the system, the ability to Create Reviewer Account allows you to add the person into the system.
Note: Please be sure to have the correct e-mail address for the person before you create an account.

INVITE A REVIEWER

Once the reviewers have been selected for the manuscript, their names will appear in the Reviewer List with a Status of Invite. Clicking on the invite icon will open an editable e-mail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reviewer, John</td>
<td>☑️ Invite</td>
<td>Selected: 09-Mar-2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>view full history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reviewer, Lilly</td>
<td>☑️ Invite</td>
<td>Selected: 09-Mar-2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>view full history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invite All

If you want to send all the invitations at one time, there is an icon called Invite All.

Selecting this icon will pop-up a window that will show the names of each reviewer and which e-mail template will be sent to the reviewer when you click on the Invite All icon. You can also select to edit any e-mail in the list before sending.
Alternate reviewer list

Some sites are configured with ability to set up an alternates list. Using the Order column, you can move reviewers into the list. If anyone from the main reviewer list declines to review, the system will auto-invite from the alternates list.

Note: Number in the main reviewer list must match the number in the Progress box in order for the alternates list to work properly.
ASSIGN A REVIEWER

Since the invite e-mail to reviewers contains links to agree and decline, usually the assign reviewer task is completed automatically by the system. However, there is a dropdown selection for the Editor to choose the appropriate response if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One the reviewer’s status is Agreed, the paper moves into the Reviewer’s Center so they may begin their review.

Decline Suggest Alternates

If the reviewer declines the invitation, they will be taken to a page to suggest alternate reviewers for the manuscript. The SE will see a link to view additional possibilities in the status column after the reviewer’s name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the results, the Editor can perform a reviewer search and view information on PubMed regarding the suggested reviewer.

**Editing Reviewer Reminders**

If a reviewer asks for an extension of completing their review, if configured, the Editor can click on the **Grant an Extension** link under the reviewer’s name to grant an extension.
Note: If the Editor does not have permissions to grant the extension, they will need to contact the journal admin to have them grant the extension.

The ability to grant the extension to the reviewer is also located on the Account Information Tab of the Person Details. The Editor can also choose to send a reminder e-mail or click on the reviewer’s name to send them an e-mail that they have been granted an extension.
Editing when the reminders are sent to a reviewer is also important. Being able to change the dates when reminders are sent and the ability to turn off reminder can be very helpful. **PSA recommends first reminders be sent within two weeks of reviewer assignment with weekly reminders thereafter.**

### Date Review Last Saved

The date a Reviewer last saved their review will be displayed in the Reviewer List History until the review is submitted. This line item provides the Editors the ability to see which Reviewers have started reviewing the manuscript without the need to proxy as each individual Reviewer. The date displayed will be the date the Reviewer last clicked the **Save as Draft** button on their Score Sheet.
Setting Search Preferences

Having the ability to customize the search option in the system allows the editor to only see the items they need.

The ability to expand and collapse the search windows and setting what is seen in the search results are just two of the options that can be in this section.
When I am searching for Reviewers, I would like the search options displayed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Option</th>
<th>Expanded</th>
<th>Collapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author's Recommended / Opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Locator Results from the Web of Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Papers Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Auto-Suggest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I am searching for Reviewers, I would like the following information populated by default:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Activity Information</th>
<th>Min:</th>
<th>Max:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Current Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Assignments in Past 12 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days Since Last Review Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Invitations Declined in Past 12 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Reviewer Search Results and Preferred/Non-Preferred Reviewers area, I would like the following fields displayed (select a maximum of five fields):

- # Current Assignments / # Assignments in Past 12 Months
- Days Since Last Review
- Average R-Score
- # Open Invitations
- Date of Last Invitation
- Average turnaround time

Number of search results per page: 10
Exclude unavailable reviewers
SECTION EDITOR ROLE AND VIEWING COMPLETED REVIEWS

When the required number of reviews has been returned, they display in the editor’s Make Decision, Make Preliminary Decision, or Make Recommendation action tab. Click on **view review** to see the completed review returned by the reviewer.

Note: These Action tabs display only after the required number of reviews are returned. Returned reviews can be viewed at any time by accessing the manuscript.

When viewing the completed review be sure to check for file attachments from the reviewer. If a file has been attached, be sure to check the content that the reviewer has not used their name in the file.
RESCIND A REVIEW

To rescind a review means to move the review back to the reviewer. This will put the review in a draft status and allow the review to make any changes that need to be made. When you rescind a review, an e-mail should pop up for you to send to the reviewer. If you do not get a pop up e-mail, click on the name of the reviewer to send a hyperlink e-mail.
MAKING PRELIMINARY MANUSCRIPT DECISIONS

In this example workflow the Section Editor makes a preliminary decision and the EIC approves the decision.
VIEWING MANUSCRIPT INFORMATION

THE MANUSCRIPT INFORMATION TAB

The Manuscript Information tab displays by default when you access the Manuscript Details page. It can be accessed through the tab at the left side of the Manuscript Details page as well.

Your journal’s Manuscript Information tab contains some/all of the following sections:

- Manuscript header
- Peer review milestones
- Version history
- Author-supplied data
- Companion paper information
- Information related to all previous actions performed on the manuscript (if configured)
- Flag Manuscripts
- Notes (Notes display at the bottom of all General Information tabs)
Manuscript Header

Manuscript Details contain a summary section at the top. This header remains at the top of pages throughout the peer review process.

The header may list the following:

- Manuscript ID – may include a revision number, “Invited”, or “Resubmission”
- Notes link – appears to the left of the manuscript ID.
- Title
- Companion Paper link – if applicable, appears to the left of the manuscript ID.
- Author (and any co-authors) – author’s name is hyperlinked for e-mail correspondence
- Status – appears green if OK, red for overdue
- Dates – submitted, last updated, total time in review
- Names and roles of people assigned to the manuscript. Names are hyperlinked for e-mail correspondence. If you have administrative permissions, you also see proxy links.
- Author Due – Date for Revised Paper
- Proofs and files – links to the HTML and PDF proofs of the submission as well as other associate files and the Author’s response (on revisions and resubmissions only)
Scroll To…

To jump directly to a section of the Manuscript Details page, select from the Scroll To… dropdown list.

Viewing Proofs

View proofs by clicking the links in the header. See the Viewing Manuscript Proofs and Files section of this document for more details.

Version History

You have access to all versions of a manuscript. Revisions are indicated by a revision number appended to the Manuscript ID. (E.g., R1 or R2.)
• Click the links in the **Decision Letter & Response** column to view decision-related correspondence regarding a previous version.

• Click on the **Switch Details** button to view the Manuscript Details page for a previous version.

**Additional Version Information**

To help you keep track of which version you are currently viewing, a colored bar displays along the left of the page indicating a revision.

• Original submission: no colored bar

• Revision: purple bar

• Resubmitted Manuscript: blue bar

Revised and Resubmitted files will also include a link to the Author’s response on the header.

When you are on the **Task Related Tab** such as Invite Reviewers, The Version History will appear on the right side of the screen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCU1-2013-10-0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submitted on 31-Oct-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clicking on the **View Review Details** for the previous version will give you the Author’s Response, Decision Letter, and Reviews.
Review Details

Print

Scroll To:

- Author's Response to Decision Letter
- Decision Letter
- Review #1 - KA
- Review #2 - AC
- Decision Comments

Comments to the Author:
This study is based on the National Birth Defects Prevention Study, a retrospective analysis of cases.

Major comments:
- Experiences from this data source in studies of teratogenic effects of drugs have shown that most likely skewed data are obtained because of recall and non-participation bias.

Thank you for the comments.