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Editorial and Publishing Policy Resource

The Cochrane Editorial and Publishing Policy Resource brings together Cochrane’s editorial and publishing policies, as well as general information about the editorial and publishing processes, and the published products, including the Cochrane Library.

Cochrane organizational policies are available in the Organizational info section of the Community site and the About us section of cochrane.org.

The Cochrane Editorial Unit welcomes feedback and suggestions for improvement. For queries relating to a specific section of the resource, please direct your query to the section editor listed at the end of the section. For general queries, please contact Harriet MacLehose (hmacleho@cochrane.org), Senior Editor, Cochrane Editorial Unit.

View the latest substantive changes.

* Sections in development
Peer review policy

- **Aims:**
  - Transparency in decision making
  - Standardise across Cochrane
  - Implement best practice

- **Key points:**
  - All Cochrane Reviews and protocols of Cochrane Reviews are peer reviewed
  - Named peer review (open identity peer review)
  - When to peer review updated reviews and updated protocols
  - Minimum/type of peer reviewers required
  - Acknowledgement of peer reviewers
Impact on CRGs

• MEs survey March 2018
  51 responses

• How often do you use named peer review?
  Always 22; frequently 8
  Occasionally 3; rarely 4; never 14

• Do you acknowledge your peer reviewers?
  Yes – on the CRG website 16
  Yes – in the acknowledgements section 32
  Yes – somewhere else 6
  No – 6
  [more than one response per CRG]
Peer review policy Implementation

• Pre-launch – Extensive guidance document (ME Support)
• April 2018 – publication of policy and guidance in EPPR
• April/May 2018 – webinars (UK/Aus time zones)
• May 2018 – identification of CRGs requiring additional support
• June onwards – working with individual CRGs and networks: transitional period
• September 2018 – workshops at Edinburgh colloquium (tbc)
• January 2019 - CRG compliance with policy
Named peer review (also known as open identity peer review)

In a named peer review process, the Cochrane Review author and peer reviewer know each other’s names and affiliations during the peer review process.
When to peer review updates of protocols

1. Updated or amended protocol

2. Is the protocol brand new? Does the protocol have one or more of the following?
   - A change in the objectives?
   - A change in the inclusion criteria?
   - A change in the methods or analysis?

3. YES
   5. Peer review required

4. NO
   6. No peer review required
   7. Peer review
   8. Edit and prepare for publication

---

Based upon a flowchart developed by the Cochrane Infectious Diseases group, 2008
1. Updated or amended review

2. Does the review have one or more of the following?
   - A change in the objectives?
   - A change in the inclusion criteria?
   - A change in the methods or analysis?
   - The addition or exclusion of studies or data?
   - Correction of serious errors?

3. YES
   5. Have the conclusions changed?
      7. Yes
         9. Peer review
      8. No
         10. Editor decides whether full peer review is required

4. NO
   6. No peer review required
     11. Edit and prepare for publication

12. Peer review
13. Selective peer review
Minimum/type of peer reviewers

Every Cochrane protocol and review will be peer-reviewed by:

- at least one clinical/topic specialist (with a minimum of one external to the CRG editorial team), and;
- one statistician/methodologist

The number and type of peer reviewers recruited to comment upon each Cochrane Review will vary, but may include:

| ✓ content specialists | ✓ methodologists |
| ✓ systematic review specialists | ✓ statisticians |
| ✓ Information Specialists | ✓ consumers |
| ✓ other potential users of the review |
Acknowledgement of peer reviewers

As a minimum, the names of all peer reviewers who have submitted a peer review report or completed peer review checklist during the current calendar year will be published on the CRG website, unless the peer reviewer has not consented to this.

Lists from previous years must be archived and publically accessible from the CRG website.
Guidance on implementation of the peer review policy
Invitation to peer reviewer

The invitation email to the peer reviewer should contain the following:

- Title, abstract and plain-language summary of the Cochrane Review (or title only if a protocol)
- Deadline for return of comments
- A statement that all of the information shared is confidential
- Link to the Cochrane conflict of interest policy (http://community.cochrane.org/editorial-and-publishing-policy-resource/ethical-considerations/conflicts-interest-and-cochrane-reviews)
Peer reviewer checklist – methodologist, specialist, consumer

Potential conflicts of interest: Peer referee statement

Do you have any potential conflict of interest?

Yes (details below) / No

You should declare and describe any present or past affiliations or other involvement in any organisation or entity with an interest in the outcome of the review that might lead to a real or perceived conflict of interest. You should report relationships that were present during the last 36 months, including, but not restricted to, financial remuneration for lectures, consultancy, travel, and whether you are an author of, or contributor to, a study that might be included in this review. You should declare potential conflicts even if you are confident that your judgement is not influenced.

Conflict of interest statement:

Peer reviewer anonymity and acknowledgement

I am willing to be identified as the author of this peer review feedback
[If no, please provide details below] Yes/No

I am happy to be acknowledged in the published Cochrane Review Yes/No

I am happy to be acknowledged on the Cochrane [NAME] Groupwebsite Yes/No
Peer reviewers who wish to remain anonymous

Add a Note to the peer reviewer’s Properties sheet in Archie

Assign the Group role ‘Referee.’
Create a new Administrative note with the Title ‘2018 closed peer review submitted.’ Add the name of the protocol/review to the Note text.

CRGs can then run the following Advanced Search for all peer reviewers who submitted closed peer review:

Select the People option at the top with Match all rows (AND) option.
Role in Group | Referee | Name of Group | Active Note Title | Contains | 2018 closed peer review submitted
How to identify peer reviewers by calendar year: option 1

Prospectively, a new custom workflow task should be inserted parallel to task D1 ‘Send comments to Contact Editor’ in the current active workflow or added to the workflow template. The new task could be named 'Add names of peer reviewers to CRG website' and the following text could be added to the Description (for that task) ‘Names of peer reviewers who agreed to be acknowledged to CRG’s website should be added’.

Retrospectively, the following advanced search could be run in Archie for a given calendar year.
The Tasks option should be selected at the top with the Match all rows (AND) option

Group | Is | Name of Group
Workflow Role | Is | External Referee
Task Name | Is | Review and comment on draft protocol
Status | Is | Completed
Start | After | 01/01/2018
End or Due | Before | 30/04/2018
How to identify peer reviewers by calendar year: option 2

Use the Notes tab for each peer reviewer who agrees to peer review and be acknowledged on the CRG website.

Assign the Group role ‘Referee’. Create a new Administrative Note in their Properties sheet. Title ‘2018 peer reviewed and agreed acknowledgement’. Note the name of the draft they reviewed in the Note text.

Select the People option with Match all rows (AND) option.

Role in Group | Referee | Name of Group | Active

Note Title | Contains | 2018 peer reviewed and agreed acknowledgement
How to acknowledge peer reviewers on your website

Add a page to your website titled **Peer reviewers 2018**

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of all peer reviewers. The Cochrane X Group aims to involve clinical peer and consumer reviewers in the assessment of all protocols and reviews before publication. The following people have contributed to the peer review process in 2018:

**Clinical reviewers:**
- XXXX
- XXXX

**Consumer reviewers:**
- XXXX
- XXXX
- XXXX

We also wish to acknowledge reviewers who have chosen to remain anonymous.
Archie and Workflows

Archie can be used to:
- hold peer reviewer contact details
- record further detail on reviewer interests in Notes
- link to relevant interests on Topics list
- record past contributions, quality of feedback, timeliness, etc.

Workflows can be used to:
- send invitation to peer reviewer
- complete the actions after acceptance
- store peer reviewer feedback
- authors responses to feedback and editorial base comments
Training server

https://training-archie.cochrane.org/resources.jsp
Peer Reviewers Using Archie and Workflows

Sally Bell-Syer and Liz Dooley

MESupport@cochrane.org
Archie and Workflows

Archie can be used to:

➢ hold peer reviewer contact details
➢ record further detail on reviewer interests in Notes
➢ link to relevant interests on Topics list
➢ record past contributions, quality of feedback, timeliness, etc.

Workflows can be used to:

➢ send invitation to peer reviewer
➢ complete the actions after acceptance
➢ store peer reviewer feedback
➢ authors responses to feedback and editorial base comments
Adding Peer Reviewers to Archie

Peer Reviewer (Referee) already in Archie – may already have a Group role with your CRG or another CRG

Search for the name in Archie, if the person is already listed - add the appropriate Group Role (e.g. Referee, Consumer Referee) to the existing person record for your CRG

If there is no existing person record:

Peer Reviewer needs to be added to Archie and given a Group role with your CRG

- Referee
- Consumer Referee
- Statistician
- Editor, Information specialist, Affiliated researcher
Adding Peer Reviewers to Archie
Select the Group Role [Referee] and add further clarification [Content Expert]
Person Properties sheet

Group Roles tab shows Referee role with further classification
Recording and searching for Peer Reviewer’s interests.

Creating an Administrative Note type: Interests
Linking Peer Reviewers’ interests to Topics list
Influenza vaccines

Pneumonia

Common cold
Advanced Search for Notes

Select the People option, Match all rows (AND)

Note Type | Is | Interest
Note Text | Contains | [topic of interest]

or

Note Type | Is | Interest
Note Title | Contains | [topic of interest]
The image shows a screenshot of a Cochrane Library page with a focus on selecting a topic. The selected topic is "Corneal diseases / Band keratopathy / Treatment." The screenshot includes a dropdown menu with various options under the "Eyes and Vision Group" category, and a "Select" button is highlighted, indicating the process of selecting a specific topic for research or analysis.
Advanced Search for Topics

Select the People option, Match all rows (AND)
Topic | Is | [select from the Topics list icon]
Recording contributions

Use the Notes tab for each Peer Reviewer who submits comments on a draft protocol/review.

Create a new Administrative note, using the Note Type: Editorial Management. Give it the title ‘Peer reviewer feedback’ and note the name of the draft they reviewed in the Note text.

List the issues you find useful to record.

The descriptions should be a concise, factual description of the feedback comments. Use standard descriptors so an Advanced Search can be run at a later date.

Select the People option with Match all rows (AND) option.

Role in Group | Referee | Name of Group | Active
Note Text | Contains | [standard descriptors]
Another example of note recording

Specialist
Response rate: 100%
Tasks completed: 11

220 03/01/2017
234 24/08/2016
246 11/11/2015 - responded same day to say could not review due to workload and requested do not use until Feb 2016
246 22/10/14
Using the workflow to manage the peer reviewer editorial process
C. Refereeing completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Invite the potential Referee to participate, and specify the date by which a reply is requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Indicate whether you agree to serve as a Referee of the specified draft protocol. If no response is received by the date of reply requested, staff at the Review Group editorial office may enter 'No response'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Identify another potential Referee and assign them the Workflow Role 'Referee'. Invite them to participate, and specify the date by which a reply is requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Confirm that the Write Phase is set to Editorial. Make the draft available to the Referee and specify the date by which comments should be returned. If accessing via Archie, confirm that any Document Role required has been assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Review the draft protocol, prepare comments, and submit these to the Review Group's editorial office by the date requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Determine whether the Referee's comments are clear and complete, or require clarification or expansion, or no response was received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Insert workflow tasks as required or take direct action to resolve issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Screenshot of workflow steps relevant to peer review editorial process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B - Internal CRG check completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1 Invite potential Referee to participate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C2 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C3 Identify another potential Referee than</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C4 Make draft protocol available to Referee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>C5 Review and comment on draft protocol</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>C6 Decision: Comments clear and complete?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>C7 Resolve issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>C - Referee completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roles available within the Archie workflow
### People tab - populated

**Workflow:** Review Development (1.4)

**General:***

- **Information Specialist:** Susan Searcher
- **Contact Person:** Charles Darwin
- **Editorial Base:** Sally EM Bell-Syer

**People:**

- **CRG Advisors:**
  - Sally EM Bell-Syer

- **Contact Editor:** Abraham Maslow
- **Editorial Base 2:** Adrian Assister

- **Referees:**
  - Timothy Leary: Specialist
  - Melanie Klein: Consumer
  - Abraham Maslow: Editor
  - Ivan Pavlov: Specialist

- **Sign-off Editor:** Abraham Maslow
- **Copy Edit Support:** Elizabeth Royce
- **Copy Editor:** Anne Lethaby

**Buttons:**
- Apply
- Close
### Workflow view after referees added

**Workflow:** Review Development (1.4)

#### In Progress | 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End or Due</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1.2 Invite potential Referee to participate Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Adrian Assister</td>
<td>Editorial Base 2</td>
<td>04/04/2018</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.3 Invite potential Referee to participate Timothy Leary</td>
<td>Adrian Assister</td>
<td>Editorial Base 2</td>
<td>04/04/2018</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.4 Invite potential Referee to participate Melanie Klein</td>
<td>Adrian Assister</td>
<td>Editorial Base 2</td>
<td>04/04/2018</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.5 Invite potential Referee to participate Abraham Maslow</td>
<td>Adrian Assister</td>
<td>Editorial Base 2</td>
<td>04/04/2018</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Not Started | 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End or Due</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2.2 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Referee: Specialist</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.3 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Timothy Leary</td>
<td>Referee: Specialist</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.4 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Melanie Klein</td>
<td>Referee: Consumer</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.5 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Abraham Maslow</td>
<td>Referee: Editor</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.2 Make draft review available to Referee Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>13/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.3 Make draft review available to Referee Timothy Leary</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>13/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.4 Make draft review available to Referee Melanie Klein</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>13/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.5 Make draft review available to Referee Abraham Maslow</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
<td>12/04/2018</td>
<td>13/04/2018</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.2 Review and comment on draft review</td>
<td>Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Referee: Specialist</td>
<td>13/04/2018</td>
<td>04/05/2018</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMATION EMAIL from Workflow Manager (C2 Invitation to referee a Cochrane review)

Dear [RECIPIENT NAME],

I would like to invite you to comment on a draft protocol/review titled [TITLE]. Prior to publication, all drafts must be refereed by a content expert and a methodologist.

Once a person agrees to be a referee, they are sent a copy of the draft and a checklist for comments. We ask referees to submit courteous and constructive comments on the draft that identify its weaknesses or fatal flaws, as well as ways of improving it. Referees are usually requested to return these comments within three weeks of receiving the draft.

Could you please let me know by [TASK END DATE] if you are able to peer referee?.

If you have any other questions or queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best,
If reviewer declines invitation

This can be recorded in the workflow

An alternative reviewer can be added and new invitation sent

If this reviewer accepts then the workflow progresses to send out the documentation to the reviewer
complete the actions after acceptance

Prepare the attachments for peer review
Upload attachments to the workflow
Send the task email
TICKET EMAIL from Workflow Manager (C5 Review and comment on draft protocol/review)

Dear [RECIPIENT NAME],

Thank you for agreeing to referee the draft protocol/review entitled [TITLE]. Please find the following attached:

1. the draft review as a PDF file; and
2. the Referee Checklist of points for your consideration.

I would be very grateful if you could complete this by [TASK END DATE]. I suggest that you save this email and, when you have refereed the draft, click on the link below to open a web page (a 'ticket'), which will allow you to let me know that you have finished.

You will be able to attach your completed checklist before you confirm that you have completed your task.

[PERFORM TASK LINK]

If you are unfamiliar with the Cochrane Collaboration's 'ticketing' system, please click the following link for details: http://archie.cochrane.org/public/ticket-explanation.html

If you have any other questions or queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sending task email with attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local file</td>
<td>Choose File</td>
<td>Save as workflow file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no file selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Template: C5 Review and comment on draft protocol/review
### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local file</td>
<td>P004_PR_checklist.docx</td>
<td>Choose File P004.PR_checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save as workflow file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local file</td>
<td>P004_TRF agreed.docx</td>
<td>Choose File P004.TRF agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save as workflow file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local file</td>
<td>Title for workflows.pdf</td>
<td>Choose File Title for workflows.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save as workflow file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local file</td>
<td>P004_COI declaration.docx</td>
<td>Choose File P004.COI declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save as workflow file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment files now stored in the Workflow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Created By</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title for workflows.pdf</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Docu</td>
<td>04/04/2018 12:30:55</td>
<td>Bell-Syer, Sally EM</td>
<td>304 KB</td>
<td>C5.2 Review and comment on draft review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_TRF agreed.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Docu</td>
<td>04/04/2018 12:30:55</td>
<td>Bell-Syer, Sally EM</td>
<td>23 KB</td>
<td>C5.2 Review and comment on draft review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR_checklist.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Docu</td>
<td>04/04/2018 12:30:55</td>
<td>Bell-Syer, Sally EM</td>
<td>22 KB</td>
<td>C5.2 Review and comment on draft review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_Coi declaration.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Docu</td>
<td>04/04/2018 12:30:55</td>
<td>Bell-Syer, Sally EM</td>
<td>23 KB</td>
<td>C5.2 Review and comment on draft review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer reviewers are invited through a task email.

Attachments are included.
Store peer reviewer feedback

Peer reviewer can upload their responses into Workflow by following the task link in the email.

When you have completed your task please indicate this using the link below, you will also be able to upload documents via the link's webpage.

[PERFORM TASK LINK]

If you have any other questions or queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

The file is then stored in the workflow.
Reviewer comments individually uploaded and then collated
Editor comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR Checklist_Collated for Authors.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_Editor comments to Authors.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR Checklist_Maslow.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR Checklist_Klein.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR Checklist_Leary.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR Checklist_Pavlov.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title for workflows.pdf</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Document</td>
<td>04/04/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progression through the workflow

Workflow has a decision point that asks if the reviewer comments are clear and complete:
- Yes / no / no response

Collated comments are sent to Editor for review

Collated comments are sent to the authors for action and response

Revised document submitted post review
Authors responses to feedback and comments from the editorial base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P004_Editor comments_Authors responses.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/01/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR Checklist_Authors Responses.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/01/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P004_PR Checklist_Callisted for Authors.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Word Document</td>
<td>05/01/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## View of workflow after all responses received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1.5 Invite potential Referee to participate Abraham Maslow</td>
<td>Adrian Assister</td>
<td>Editorial Base 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.2 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Referee: Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.2 Make draft review available to Referee Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.2 Review and comment on draft review</td>
<td>Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Referee: Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.3 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Timothy Leary</td>
<td>Referee: Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.4 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Melanie Klein</td>
<td>Referee: Consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.5 Decision: Agree to serve as Referee?</td>
<td>Abraham Maslow</td>
<td>Referee: Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6.2 Decision: Comments clear and complete? Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.3 Make draft review available to Referee Timothy Leary</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.4 Make draft review available to Referee Melanie Klein</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.5 Make draft review available to Referee Abraham Maslow</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.3 Review and comment on draft review</td>
<td>Timothy Leary</td>
<td>Referee: Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.4 Review and comment on draft review</td>
<td>Melanie Klein</td>
<td>Referee: Consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.5 Review and comment on draft review</td>
<td>Abraham Maslow</td>
<td>Referee: Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6.3 Decision: Comments clear and complete? Timothy Leary</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6.4 Decision: Comments clear and complete? Melanie Klein</td>
<td>Sally EM Bell-Syer</td>
<td>Editorial Base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training server

https://training-archie.cochrane.org/resources.jsp