Chief Reviewer's Role
The CARDIA Study

The Chief Reviewer for a manuscript serves as the Publications & Presentations (P&P) Committee's representative in communicating with the first author.

1. The Chief Reviewer assembles all of the P&P Committee’s comments, as well as comments from the CARDIA Steering Committee and communicates them to the first author.

2. The Chief Reviewer makes a recommendation to the P&P Committee for approval, provisional approval or disapproval. The P&P Committee has final authority.

3. Provisional approval may mean that the P&P Committee delegates the authority for final approval to the Chief Reviewer (see below).

4. The Chief Reviewer in conjunction with the Principal Investigator of the originating center ensure that all issues have been rectified prior to journal submission.

5. The Chief Reviewer receives the results of the manuscript verification performed at the Coordinating Center and the Statistical Review performed by the Statistical Reviewer who is affiliated with the Coordinating Center and ensures that all issues have been resolved with the first author prior to journal submission.

The Chief Reviewer’s role involves:

1. Reading and critiquing the paper,

2. Collecting other investigator's comments,

3. Communicating with the first author regarding the identified issues,

The first author should be informed of any issues prior to the conference call discussion.

4. Discussing with the first author if it is reasonable to consider the manuscript on the next available (or decided upon) P&P Committee conference call or if the discussion should be postponed.

5. After fully discussing all comments and/or suggestions with the first author, a recommendation should be made to the P&P Committee on the conference call regarding approval or disapproval of the manuscript. A written summary of your review distributed to the first author and Dr. Catarina Kiefe (Catarina.Kiefe@umassmed.edu) prior to the call is encouraged and a very brief summary should be given explaining your decision on the call. Only major concerns should be discussed at length on the conference call. However, all concerns should be discussed and resolved with the first author.
6. There are several levels of the approval process. Often the decision is dependent on the nature and extent of revisions. It is the Chief Reviewer's responsibility to assure that all concerns have been appropriately addressed.

A. A manuscript may be approved or provisionally approved.

1. Approval signifies that the manuscript is ready for submission to a journal once the suggested revisions are made.

2. Provisional approval allows the Chief Reviewer and first author to resolve all identified issues. Generally, provisional approval is granted when major revisions are not required. Once again, the Chief Reviewer will be required to make certain that all concerns have been addressed appropriately.

If, after provisional approval, the identified concerns/issues cannot be resolved between the first author and Chief Reviewer, the P&P Committee should once again be contacted and the manuscript rescheduled for another review. If this occurs, the unresolved issue(s) should be provided in writing by the Chief Reviewer and/or first author and distributed to the P&P Committee prior to the conference call.

B. A manuscript may be disapproved; the P&P Committee may want to see a revised version if there are major problems. In some instances, an ad hoc committee may be appointed to review the manuscript in lieu of full P&P Committee review.

The Co-chief Reviewer:

Occasionally, if warranted by the nature of the manuscript, a Co-chief Reviewer may be appointed. This person should funnel their concerns to the first author and through the Chief Reviewer. The Chief Reviewer and Co-chief Reviewer will work together in the review of the manuscript. In most instances, the Chief Reviewer is considered the primary reviewer, but if there is a problem with agreement, the final decision will be the consensus of the P&P Committee.