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JVS Journals Review Process

1. Editorial staff review paper by submission type
   a. Determination that paper meets criteria
2. Assignment to an editor for review
   a. Journal Board (1)
   b. Journal reviewers (2)
   c. Statistical reviewer (1)
3. Grading of paper by reviewers with comments and requirements and suggestions for necessary changes
4. Decision on paper by Editor
   a. Accept (5%), minor (10%), major (60%) revise, reject (25%)
5. Revision of paper by author
   a. Re-review by reviewers to see if corrections made

---

Most Important Question for a Reviewer

Is the Research Idea or Question Important to JVS Journal Readers?

- **Topic**
  - Addresses an Issue that is Debated or Not resolved
    - “What is the impact of treatment of type 2 endoleaks on long-term survival?”
- **New Technology**
  - The early results of a new NTNT device for superficial vein Rx
- **Multi-institutional when single institution inadequate**
  - What is the best treatment for adventitial cystic disease?

---

Is It Original?

- Zinsser, professor, editor of “Book of the Month”, author of “On Writing Well”

Every word that serves no function, every long word that could be a short word, every adverb that carries the same meaning that’s already in the verb, every passive construction that leaves the reader unsure of who is doing what — these are the thousand and one adulterants that weaken the strength of a sentence.
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Is It Well Written?

( Grammar and Syntax )

- Zinsser, professor, editor of “Book of the Month”, author of “On Writing Well”
Did the Authors Use SVS/AVF Reporting Standards and Practice Guidelines?

- Case report: CARE Guidelines
- Observational study: Use STROBE guidelines
- Prospective randomized trial: Use CONSORT guidelines
- Systematic Review or a Meta-analysis: Use PRISMA guidelines

www.care-statement.org  www.consort-statement.org
www.strobe-statement.org  www.prisma-statement.org

Did the Authors Use A Statistical Co-author From the Beginning

Observational study: Use STROBE guidelines
Prospective randomized trial: Use CONSORT guidelines
Systematic Review or a Meta-analysis: Use PRISMA guidelines

Long-term Data in Lifetables is the Biggest Challenge in JVS Journals

- Goal = minimum of 1 year follow-up
- > 70% of initial patients enrolled
- Two curves should stop or be truncated when the SE of the curves is >10%

“If you need statistics to see something—it cannot be important” – Roger Unger
“A difference, to be a difference, must make a difference” HL Mencken

Lifetable (Kaplan-Meier)

Other Issues That Should Be Identified By Reviewers

- Abstract and manuscript are different
- Research question or aims not clearly stated
- Methods unclear
- Tables and figures are repeated in text
- Authors confuse cause and effect with association
- Limitations not identified in the discussion
- References don’t include author’s previous work or other’s work—“slicing the salami”/plagiarism

Current Templates for JVS, JVS-VL, JVS-CIT Reviews

- Additional Questions:
  - Reviewer COI?
  - Suggest Commentary
  - Request Statistical Review
  - Good fit for CME?
A guided review experience with more yes/no questions related to:
- Scope
- Originality and place in the literature
- Appropriate title, and introductory material
- Detailed, reproducible methods
- Accurate, helpful graphics
- Consistent grading, comments to authors/editors and final recommendation

In Development:
Systematic Templates

Grading System for Reviewers

Conclusions for Reviewers of JVS Papers

Reviewers should use a systematic approach for reviews
- The topic must be important and original
- There must be a well developed research question
- Abstract and paper must match
- Paper must use reporting standards and practice guidelines
- Statistics must be appropriate and understandable
  » Power calculations are important
- Results must be presented with appropriate graphs and tables- particularly lifetables
- Discussion must put paper in context/explain limitations

Reviewers confidential comments to editors must match comments and suggestions to the authors