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Mission Statement

The *Journal of Geriatric Oncology* is an:

International, **multidisciplinary** journal focused on advancing research in the treatment and survivorship issues of older adults with cancer, as well as literature relevant to **education** and **policy** development in geriatric oncology.

The official journal of the International Society of Geriatric Oncology
Journal Growth

No. of Submissions
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International Readership

Geographical Distribution of ScienceDirect Usage: 2013

- North America, 21%
- Asia, 25%
- Western Europe, 31%
- South America, 6%
- Africa, 2%
- Mid-America, 1%
- Eastern Europe, 5%
- Australia, 4%
- Middle East, 5%
Author Information

Geographical Distribution of Authors: 2013

- North America, 49%
- Western Europe, 41%
- Asia, 6%
- South America, 2%
- Australia, 2%
Increased Online Usage: Science Direct Downloads

Online Usage Trend

- 2010: 0
- 2011: 4000
- 2012: 10000
- 2013: 16000
- 2014 (YTD): 25000

Chart showing the online usage trend from 2010 to 2014, with a significant increase in 2014 (YTD).
Journal of Geriatric Oncology
now Indexed by PubMed/MEDLINE
Milestones

2010
• *Journal of Geriatric Oncology* launched as the official journal of SIOG

2011
• Indexed by Science Citation Index Expanded, Current Contents/ Clinical Medicine, and Journal Citation Reports
• First impact factor awarded by Thomas Reuters
• 2011 Impact factor: 1.000

2012
• Indexed by PubMed/Medline
• Launched “Meet the Expert” series
• 2012 Impact factor: 1.118
• Expansion of the editorial team
  - 2 deputy editors and 4 new associate editors

2013
• 2013 Impact factor: 1.146

2014
• Launch of the “Geriatrics for Oncologists” series
• Increasing to 6 issues a year
Impact Factor

Calculation for Journal Impact Factor

\[
\frac{\text{2013 cites to articles published in 2011-2012}}{\text{Number of articles published in 2011-2012}} = \frac{94}{82} = 1.146
\]
Types Of Manuscripts

- Original Research
- Review Articles
- Education and Training Articles
- Meeting Reports
- Letters to the Editors
- Invited Articles: Meet the Experts, Editorials, Perspectives
Editors

Editor-in-Chief
Arti Hurria

Deputy Editors
Siri Rostoft
Supriya Gupta Mohile

Associate Editors
Heidi Klepin
William Tew
Tanya M. Wildes
Hans Wildiers
Editorial Board

- 47 members
- International representation
  - 10 countries
- Multiple disciplines

Journal of Geriatric Oncology

- Surgery
- Geriatrics
- Radiology
- Psychiatry
- Palliative Care
- Internal Medicine
- Oncology
- Hematology
- Psychology
- Rehabilitative Medicine
How to Get Involved

- Subscribe
- Publish
- Cite
- Review
Thank you so much for the opportunity to be your Editor-in-Chief

Arti Hurria, MD
ahurria@coh.org
626-256-4673 ext.62821
The Reviewing Process
Editorial Review

Check the manuscript for:

- Mistakes in procedures or logic
- Conclusions not supported by the results
- Errors or omissions in the references
- Compliance with ethics standards
- Originality and significance of the work
Comment on novelty and significance

Recommend whether the manuscript is suitable for publication

Confidential comments will not be disclosed to the Author(s)

Comments to the Editors
Comments to the Authors

Provide specific comments on the design

Comments on the presentation of data, results and discussion

Comments to the author(s) are consistent with your recommendation to the editors
Editorial Process

- Manuscript submitted
- Reviewed by Editor’s team
- May be reassigned to a deputy or an associate editor
- First decision made
  - Send out to review
  - Outright reject
- Time to first decision (~25 days)
### Rejection Without External Review

The Editor or designee evaluates submissions and determines whether they are rejected or sent to Deputy or Associate Editors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English language is inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior publication of the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple simultaneous submissions of same data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rejection Without External Review

Assigned Editor receives manuscript

Carefully reviews manuscript to determine suitability for publication

If decision for rejection, sends manuscript other editors with rationale

Group decision is obtained

Rejection often maintained if manuscript is disorganized, there are methodologic concerns, and if there is no specific geriatrics focus
Articles are initially reviewed by at least two Reviewers.

When invited, the Reviewer receives the abstract of the manuscript.

The Editor generally requests that the article be reviewed within 2-4 weeks.

Articles are revised until the Reviewers agree, or until the Editor decides that the Reviewer concerns have been adequately addressed.

The Reviewers’ reports help the Editors to reach a decision on a submitted paper.
Review Process (II)

If a report has not been received after 4 weeks, the editorial office contacts the Reviewer.

If there is a notable disagreement between the reports of the Reviewers, a third Reviewer may be consulted.

The anonymity of the Reviewers is maintained, unless a Reviewer asks the Editor to have their identity made known.
Review Process (III)

Reviewers must not communicate directly with Authors

All manuscripts and materials must be treated confidentially by Editors and Reviewers

The aim is to have a review decision to the authors by 4-6 weeks after submission

Meeting the schedule objectives requires a significant effort by all involved

Reviewers should treat Authors as they themselves would like to be treated
Final Decision

• Editors work with reviewers until a decision can be made

• Statistical review or 3rd reviewer may require extra time

• After decision for acceptance, manuscript goes through a final editorial “read-through” before decision is sent to authors
Review Times

• Time for editorial review: within 7 days
  – Outright reject decision
  – Send out for review

• Time to decision with review: ~25 days
  – Included time taken by referees to review manuscript
‘How To Review a Manuscript’
The Reviewer’s Role
Should I Accept to Review?

• Is the paper about a topic that I am familiar with/interested in?

• Think about yourself as a “general reader” in the field

• Are you familiar with the methodology? (Statistical help available)
# General Impression and Abstract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Impression</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short summary of the article</td>
<td>Is it a real summary of the paper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid personal remarks about the Authors</td>
<td>Is it too long?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| General comprehension of the manuscript | Including the key results |
| Language/style/grammar | Journals set a limit for the number of words |
| Reviewer’s general level of enthusiasm | Add such remarks to “comments to Editor” |
Validity of Study

• Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the study
• Is the design right for answering the research question?
• Were the data collected adequately? Was the sampling right?
• Are the methods described adequately?
• Are the analyses right? Should they be redone?
Validity of Study

• Ideally you might add up some of the tables. You probably can’t do this for all tables, but if one or two are wrong it raises important questions

• Are the conclusions supported by the data?

• Do the authors go beyond the evidence in their conclusions?
Ethical Issues

• Important point

• Do you have worries regarding ethical issues?

• All studies considered for publications in JGO need to include an ethical approval (in the US: IRB, various committees in Europe and outside Europe)

• Even for retrospective studies (need permission to access medical records)
Introduction

Is it effective, clear and well organized?

Does it really introduce and put into perspective what follows?

Suggest changes in organization and point Authors to appropriate citations

Don’t just write “the Authors have done a poor job”
Can a colleague reproduce the experiments and get the same outcomes?

Did the Authors include proper references to previously published methodology?

Is the description of new methodology accurate?

Could or should the Authors have included supplementary material?

Results should not be in the methods section

Assessing the Methodology

Statistical assistance is available
Results and Discussion

Suggest improvements in the way data is shown
If you find the results difficult to understand, others will too!

Comment on general logic and on justification of interpretations and conclusions
Assessing the Conclusions

Comment on importance, validity and generality of conclusions

Request toning down of unjustified claims and generalizations

Request removal of redundancies and summaries

The abstract, not the conclusion, summarizes the study
The conclusion is often too long
# References: Tools for Reviewers (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Editors</th>
<th>For Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Plagiarism detection tool at time of submission – will soon be implemented | • Free access to ScienceDirect: [ScienceDirect](#)  
All content published by Elsevier  
• Free access to Scopus: [Scopus](#)  
The world's largest abstract and citation database  
• Reference-linking and resolution in PDF of the manuscript |
Editors’ View: What Makes a Good Reviewer?

- Provides a thorough and comprehensive report
- Submits the report on time
- Provides well-founded comments for Authors
- Gives constructive criticism
- Demonstrates objectivity
- Provides a clear recommendation to the Editor
Example of Outstanding Review

• Thank you for an interesting paper, with informative results on the incidence and mortality trends in SEER data in EE vs younger patients/individuals from 1973-2009. I really enjoyed reading the paper, and particularly liked Table 2.

• I have some suggestions for improvements which I would like to see addressed or responded to, and they are outlined below. I also have some minor issues, which may be resolved at the authors discretion, as indicated below.
Concerns to be addressed/responded to:

1. The abstract conclusion is only descriptive (i.e. a summary of results), and do not link up to the title and screening focus otherwise portrayed.

2. I appreciate the analyses presented, but I would like to see also the age group 70-85 included. If this will not be done, for some reason, please include an explanation for why this group was left out, and discuss possible consequences of this exclusion. In my opinion, changes in screening rates would first portray themselves in this age group, so I have a hard time following the line of argumentation when this group is not included.
3. I follow the discussion for changes in incidence, but I have a hard time following the discussion on changes in mortality, as there is no or little discussion of the change in life expectancy and the change in mortality for other competing causes of death in the time period considered.

4. There are certain concerns voiced on screening, please refer to the pro/contra screening discussion and include some publications on why screening may be problematic (e.g. numerous articles by Welch et al.)
Thank You!

• Reviewers are invaluable for JGO

• We need more reviewers

• We need YOU!
Questions for Discussion
Thank You

Sarah Jenkins
Publisher – Oxford, UK

David Vargas
Journal Manager – San Diego, USA

Ruslana Khatagova
Marketing Manager – London, UK

Vani Katheria
Assistant to Editor-in-Chief – Duarte, USA
Thank You: Editors

Founding Editor
Matti S. Aapro

Deputy Editors
Siri Rostoft
Supriya Gupta Mohile

Associate Editors
Heidi Klepin
William Tew
Tanya M. Wildes
Hans Wildiers
Thank You: Editorial Board

Shabbir Alibhai
Kimlin T. Ashing-Giwa
Riccardo Audisio
Lodovico Balducci
John Bennett
Roberto Bernabei
Laura Biganzoli
Etienne Brain
Kathryn Bylow
K.L. Cheung
Harvey J. Cohen
Herve Cure
William Dale
Jean-Pierre Droz
William Ershler
Martine Extermann

Cesare Gridelli
Cary Gross
Niraj J. Gusani
Marije E. Hamaker
Holly Holmes
Michael Jaklitsch
M. Margaret Kemeny
Gretchen Kimmick
Beatriz Korc
Stuart Lichtman
Silvio Monfardini
Vicki Morrison
Joanne Mortimer
Hyman Muss
Arash Naeim
Christian Nelson

J.W.R. Nortier
Cynthia Owusu
Lazzaro Repetto
Miriam Rodin
Andrew Roth
Benjamin Smith
Reinhard Stauder
Christopher Steer
Catherine Terret
Edward (Ted) Trimble
Joost van der Sijp
Barbara L. van Leeuwen
Louise Walter
Ulrich Wedding
Gilbert Zulian