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Impact Factor – Reputation
Annual **Reviewer** Time Spent on Rejected Papers across 12,000 STM journals

15,070,706 Hours = 1,720 Years

\[
\begin{align*}
1,008,074 / 3600 &= 280 \\
3,360,247 \times 0.21 &= 705,652 \\
3,360,247 - 705,652 &= 2,654,595 \\
2.3 \times 5 &= 11.5 \\
11.5 \times 1,310,496 &= 15,070,706 \\
15,070,706 / 8,760 &= 1,720 \\
12,000 \times 280 &= 3,360,247 \\
3,360,247 \times 0.4 &= 1,344,099 \\
2,654,595 - 1,344,099 &= 1,310,496
\end{align*}
\]
How to Reduce Journal Loops

1. Submit to the best matched journal for your paper

2. Make reviews portable and submit once

3. Submit to a “Valid Science” Journal
Finding the Best Journal
How to Address Journal Loops?
Two-Way Matching: Editor Tools
A New Flavor of Peer Review

INDEPENDENT
Standardized Rating Criteria

• Quantitative & Qualitative
• Supplements Journal Review
• Informs Journal Recommendation
Our Scorecard Rubric

Quality of Research

Quality of Presentation

Novelty & Interest

Novelty & Interest *

Novelty

- High
- Med
- Low
- N/A

New technique, method, or approach (proof of principle)

New question, theory or hypothesis (totally new idea)

New result, discovery, or perspective/synthesis (proves an established idea)

Interest

- of broad interest to researchers in this field and other fields
- of broad interest within the field
- of moderate interest within the field
- of interest to a small group within the field
- of limited interest

Quality of Research *

Hypothesis, Objective, Rationale

- Meets all criteria
- Rationale is unclear:
  - Objective/hypothesis is not supported by background
  - Objective/hypothesis is not stated
- Other - see comments

Methods and Data

- Meets all criteria
- Missing essential references
- Design/techniques not up-to-date
- Missing important details for reproducibility
- Missing some experimental controls
- Inappropriate statistical analyses
- Missing an important experiment
- Approach/data not consistent with objectives/hypothesis
- Other - see comments

Quality of Presentation *

Title, abstract, and introduction

- Meets all criteria
- Title is inappropriate
- Background/hypothesis is missing from abstract or introduction
- Methods are missing from abstract
- Conclusions are missing from abstract
- Hypothesis/objective is missing from abstract or introduction
- Results are missing from abstract
- Other - see comments

Results (text)

- Meets all criteria
- Excessive repetition of data (e.g., from tables or figures)
- Poorly organized or not sufficiently presented
- Missing significance indications (e.g., *p-values)
- Not focused on objectives
- Other - see comments

Results (figures, graphs, and tables)

- Meets all criteria
- Problems with ordering, numbering, titles, or labels
- Data presentation is inappropriate for the experiments performed
- Images are of poor quality
- Figures are too complex, confusing, or unclear
- Captions, footnotes, or legends are incomplete or missing
- Missing important data
- Other - see comments

Discussion

- Meets all criteria
- Missing concise and accurate summary of results
- Missing discussion of potential limitations
- Biased commentary
- Insufficient comparison to relevant literature/previous results
- Not consistent with objective/hypothesis
- Other - see comments

Conclusions

- Meets all criteria
- Missing take-away statements
- Vague, overstated, or unrelated applicability
- Not consistent with discussion or objectives
- Not supported by the data
- Other - see comments
Working with Journals

INDEPENDENT Standardized Rating Criteria

TRADITIONAL Journal Specific Criteria

VALID SCIENCE Criteria
SAT/Common Application : Universities
Rubriq: Publishers

Independent, Standardized Scores

Standard Application for Universities with Different Acceptance Criteria
Hello Keith

Welcome to the Rubriq Network!

Thank you for joining Rubriq. You will be able to use this one central account for all network functions (author, reviewer, and journal). You can easily switch from one role to another by clicking on the dashboard links at the top of the page.

Authors: We have just expanded to cover over 200 biological and medical fields. We have also added journal recommendation to our service in this second beta phase. The price for this service is $600. Click on the "Submit your paper" button above to get started.

Reviewers: Join the peer review revolution! Start the database by clicking on the "Apply to be a reviewer" button on the right-hand-side menu. You can find a list of all reviewers from all STM fields.

Journal editors: If you received an invitation email, click on the "Submit your paper" button above to get started. If you have not received an invitation, you can fill out a request form. If you need help with journal options, visit our journal page.

If you have any questions about your account, our plans or the Rubriq service, visit our help@rubriq.com.

Active and recent submissions

You have not submitted any manuscripts. Submit your paper.

Submit your paper

Provide your article type and select your area(s) of study

- Submission Type: Select your submission type
- Area(s) of Study: Select at least one area of study

Enter the title and abstract of your submission

- Title
- Abstract

Phase two service

Price: $600.00 per manuscript
Completed by: May 55, 2013

Includes:
- matching to reviewers by subject area,
- completed Rubriq scorecard with feedback and ratings from three reviewers,
- journal recommendation report
- Thematic report

Continue
How it works…

1. Classification & Manuscript Report
2. Reviewer Report (R-score)
3. Journal Recommendations
4. Optional Journal Matching
Rubriq scorecard

Manuscript: Treatment of XX-induced hepatotoxicity through upregulation of XX

Client: Jonathan Doeasars

R-Score: 5.3 / 10

Quality of Research — 7.1
Quality of Presentation — 6.1
Novelty & Interest — 6.1

Reviewer 1:
This paper has a very low chance of publications until the Western blots are corrected; they do not look clear. Dose-response data may not be a deal breaker but it would help. The authors need to discuss cause and effects in greater detail. Did XX cause autophagy or did the toxicity caused by XX cause autophagy, as is widely believed? I do not think this paper is sufficiently strong to change current opinions.

Reviewer 2:
Overall, this is an interesting study on the effects of XX on mitochondrial autophagy. Because the field that will be interested in this study is somewhat small, the potential impact is limited. That said, most of the techniques used were state-of-the-art and were done well. However, the use of single methods to address a question leads to over-interpretation and some inappropriate conclusions. These issues could be improved with the addition of several new experiments.

Reviewer 3:
My overall impression of this manuscript is that it will be suitable for publication with extensive editing. The overall message of the manuscript is missed due to the errors in the figures and legends. These errors need to be resolved and the manuscript checked for correspondence between the figures, legends and the with the manuscript text in general. Overall the science is sound, although some points of the results will need to be refined according to the edited figures and legends.
Journal recommendation report

Manuscript: Treatment of XX-induced hepatotoxicity through upregulation of XX

R-score: 5.3

Client: Jonathan Doesarus

Compiled on April 23rd, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal name</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th>Strength of match</th>
<th>Acceptance rate</th>
<th>Rubriq network status</th>
<th>Time from submission to acceptance</th>
<th>Time from acceptance to online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry and Cell Biology Journal</td>
<td>2.350</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Hepatology Research</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Organelle Research</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Stuff International</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracellular Biochemistry</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioenergee</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autophagy Research</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitochondriawesome</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>113 days</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Catabolism</td>
<td>2.780</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93 days</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Heavy Metal Band-Induced Toxicity</td>
<td>3.140</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Business Model

Author is Customer

Reviewers (and/or labs) are paid
Direct or Rubriq Credit

Free Service to Editors/Publishers

Goal is a faster path to publication in the best journal for the author
Parallel Beta Tests Across Six Publishers
Beta Feedback

Editors

“...Despite initial skepticism...the editors were really impressed with the way the scorecard worked”

“...would be pleased to participate in the next phase and be part of the Network”

“...They felt it just goes to show that if you pay postdocs a relatively small amount, and they are the right people, they will do a good and thorough job”

Reviewers

“...really impressed with the way in which Rubriq has been set up. There is a genuine interest in evolving the review process to provide authors with meaningful, multi-faceted reviews of their work”

“Very supportive of this effort, both as a recognition of the time and effort a good review takes, and of the prospect that reviewers might improve their game, and thus help raise the quality of research more globally”

“...I really like the scorecard. It captures the many ways in which a paper can be evaluated...”
Joining the Journal Network

**VERIFIED**: Journal logged in, claimed profile, and updated information

**ACTIVE**: Welcome the Rubriq Report with submissions and can access unpublished papers in the network

**PARTNER**: Active members who provide some additional advantage to authors who submit with a Rubriq Report
Time’s Up!

About your speaker:
Name: Keith Collier
Company: Rubriq
Email: keith.collier@rubriq.com
Social Media:
  twitter: keithecollier or rubriqnews
  linkedin: http://linkd.in/QZ5j1c