

Report to the RSNA Board of Directors

Annual Report of the Editor, RADIOLOGY

Herbert Y. Kressel, MD, Editor

November 2016

JOURNAL HIGHLIGHTS:

Journal Year 2016 – RADIOLOGY: January 1 - August 31, 2016:

- Journal Year 2016 began in January 1, 2016 and will end on December 31, 2016. This report is for the first eight months of 2016. The total number of submissions for the first eight months was 1978, which if continued through the next four months, will result in a total of 2967 submissions, a 5% increase from the past year (2015 total for Journal Year 2015 was 2816)
- 34% of submissions were received from North America, with 66% being International, for the first eight months of Journal Year 2016. This is nearly the same as Journal Year 2015 when 35% of submissions were from North America.
- The average time to first decision for the first eight months of Journal Year 2016 was 36 days. Average time to first decision for prior years was: 30 days (2015) 30 days (2014), 31 days (2013), 36 days (2012), 37 days (2011), 35 days (2010), 32 days (2009), 33 days (2008), 37 days (2007), 34 days (2006), 34 Days (2005), 38 days (2004), 41 days (2003), 38 days (2002), 35 days (2001), 38 days (2000), 44 days (1999), 49 days (1998), and 54

days (1997). The increase in time to first decision occurred over the spring and summer and was due to staffing shortages and sick leave issues for those processing manuscripts as well as to delays relating to author unfamiliarity with the requirement for checklists to accompany certain types of submissions. By September we were able to reduce the processing backlog to normal levels and have seen the time to first decision begin to return to normal levels in October.

- Of decisions made the first eight months of 2016, 6.7% were made more than 59 days after manuscript receipt (3.2% for Journal Year 2015, 2.3% for Journal Year 2014, 2.0% for Journal Year 2013, 3.0% for Journal Year 2012, 5.0% for Journal Year 2011, 3.1% for Journal Year 2010, 2.7% for Journal Year 2009, 4.6% for Journal Year 2008 and 5.9% for Journal Year 2007). For the first eight months of Journal Year 2016, decisions made more than 49 days after manuscript receipt accounted for approximately 18.2% of decisions, an increase from Journal Year 2015 when it was 9.8% (Journal Year 2014 8.2% Journal Year 2013 - 7.8%, Journal Year 2012 – 10.4%, Journal Year 2011 – 12.9%, Journal Year 2010 – 9.6% of decisions, Journal Year 2009 - 9% of decisions, Journal Year 2008 - 12% of decisions and Journal Year 2007 was 21%).
- Overall, for the first eight months of 2016 approximately 81.8% of all decisions were made within 49 days of manuscript receipt, down from 2015 when approximately 90.2% of all decisions were made within 49 days of manuscript receipt (Journal Year 2014 – 91.8%, Journal Year 2013 – 92.2%, Journal Year 2012 – 90.6%, Journal Year 2011

– 87.1%, Journal Year 2010 – 90.4%, Journal Year 2009 - 91%, Journal Year 2008 - 88% and Journal Year 2007 - 79%).

- For the first eight months of Journal Year 2016, we received 11 manuscripts relating to Scientific Posters presented or to be presented at RSNA meetings (2003-2016). Three of these 11 have been accepted, for an acceptance rate of 27.3% (26.7% in Journal Year 2015, 0% in Journal Year 2014, 3.6% in Journal Year 2013, 8% in Journal Year 2012, 10% in Journal Year 2011, 17% in 2010, 10% in Journal Year 2009, 4.8% in Journal Year 2008 and 14% in Journal Year 2007).
- Our overall acceptance rate for the first eight months of Journal Year 2016 continues to decrease over time, currently at 13% (15% for Journal Year 2015, 15% for Journal Year 2014, 14% for Journal Year 2013, 16% for Journal Year 2012, 19% for Journal Year 2011, 17% for Journal Year 2010, 19.7% for Journal Year 2009, 19.0% for Journal Year 2008 and 20.2% for Journal Year 2007). The overall acceptance rate for major manuscripts (includes meeting original research papers, non-meeting original research papers, scientific posters, technical developments, case reports) was 9.4% (10.8% for 2015, 11.7% for 2014, 10.3% for 2013, 11.6% for 2012, 14.4% for 2011; 12.2% for 2010; 14.4% for 2009, 12.9% in 2008 and 14.5% in 2007). The acceptance rate for meeting papers (original research papers presented at the meeting, but not the scientific posters that are tracked separately) was 9.2% (13% for 2015, 16.7% for 2014, 14.3% for 2013, 12.7% for 2012, 18.8% for 2011, 15.4% in 2010, 16.1% in 2009, 19.4% in 2008 and 22.0% in

2007) and for non-meeting papers (original research not presented at the meeting, technical developments, case reports, but not scientific posters that are tracked separately) was 9.4% (10.4% in 2015, 11.1% in 2014, 9.9% in 2013, 11.5% in 2012; 13.7% in 2011; 11.6% in 2010; 14.1% in 2009, 13.1% in 2008 and 14.5% in 2007).

- The overall acceptance rate for North-American submissions for the first eight months of Journal Year 2016 was 19.6% (22.2% in 2015, 23.2% in 2014, 18.8% in 2013, 24.5% in 2012, 25.8% in 2011, 23.4% in 2010, 30.2% in 2009, 27.9% in 2008 and 29.7% in 2007), while that for all International submissions was 9.2%, (11.2% in 2015, 10.9% in 2014, 11.1% in 2013, 11.2% in 2012, 15.8% in 2011, 13.1% in 2010, 13.4% in 2009, 14.3% in 2008 and 14.4% in 2007). Those acceptance rates include items that are solicited and also items that are not original research type manuscripts. However, of all original research type manuscripts accepted for publication, approximately 51% are North American and 49% International.
- For the first eight months of Journal Year 2016, of the total number of submissions, 93% were major (original research type) manuscripts. In 2015, 2014 and 2013 it was also 92%; 2012, 2011 and 2010 it was 90%; 2009 it was 89%; 2008 and 2007 it was 90%.

- The sections with the highest number of submissions for Journal Year 2016 include, in decreasing order: Neuroradiology, Abdominal Imaging, Vascular and Interventional Radiology, Musculoskeletal Imaging, Genitourinary Imaging, Breast Imaging, and Thoracic Imaging.

ONLINE JOURNAL AND SOCIAL MEDIA:

- There has been considerable growth in the online journal usage this year. In 2016 there was an average of 524,000 full text views per month over the first 10 months. This compares to an average of 446,000 full text views per month over the comparable period in 2015. This represents a 17.5% increase year to date. Similarly in 2016 there was an average of 292,800 unique visitors per month which compares favorably with the average of 216,300 unique visitors per month in 2015. This represents a 35% increase year to date.
- Over the first 10 months of 2016 there has been a decline in mobile application users. In 2016 we averaged 3393 users per month, which was down from the average of 3856 over the first 10 months of 2015. This represents a 12% decrease.
- Podcast usage continues to be strong, and has grown considerably over the past year. Over the first 10 months of 2016 the new podcasts for each month averaged 1735 downloads per month, while over the same period in 2015 the average was 1341. This

represents a 30% increase. We have recognized that when downloading podcasts many users download podcasts from several months at a time. Thus the total downloads per month probably is more representative of overall interest. Over the first 10 months of 2016 total podcast downloads per month averaged 6960, while over the same period of 2015 the average per month was 6318. We estimate that the total downloads for 2016 will exceed 83,000 downloads. It is uncertain what is driving this growth; however over the past year, we have tried to make better use of social media to generate interest in the podcast offerings.

EDITORIAL POLICIES:

- We have continued our editorial pre-review. Year-to-date 2016, 21 % of submitted manuscripts have been rejected by the editors without full peer review. Pre-review continues to be well received; when authors dispute the decision we have typically accommodated their request for full peer review. This is a rare occurrence.
- There have been 25 requests for Fast-Track processing to date in 2016. Thirteen of these have been approved; nine of the thirteen have been accepted for publication. Of the twelve not approved for Fast-Track processing all were processed using our regular procedures. Two of these twelve have been accepted for publication. In addition, two additional manuscripts which were originally not processed on the Fast-Track were expedited to publication at the time of provisional acceptance.

TOOLKITS FOR AUTHORS AND REVIEWERS:

- This year we have added additional materials to the Toolkit for authors. The Toolkit is part of the “Publication Information for Authors.” It includes links to a variety of useful information for authors including ICMJE (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors) authorship criteria, STARD (Standards for Reporting Diagnostic Accuracy Studies), CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials), and PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analysis) guidelines, as well as editorials we have written on ethical and statistical issues. This year, we published an editorial, “2016 Reviewing for Radiology – Reporting Guidelines and Why We Use Them.” We are also creating a new reviewer toolkit. We hope that the material will be a useful resource for our authors and reviewers and serve to further clarify our expectations for submitted manuscripts and improve the overall quality of the studies we publish.

INITIATIVE MANDATING USE OF INTERNATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR REPORTING BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH:

- As I noted in my 2015 Report, in 2016 we began to require use of STARD, STROBE, CONSORT and PRISMA guideline checklist for studies of diagnostic accuracy, observational studies, randomized controlled clinical trials and systematic reviews and meta-analyses respectively. In February 2016 we began to require submission of the

submitted guideline checklist for each of the relevant study types. The author-completed checklists were made available to peer reviewers and to the editors to inform their decision making and scientific editing for those manuscripts accepted for publication.

- Not unexpectedly, authors and reviewers were somewhat confused by the checklists and the new requirements for submission, despite making a variety of related materials available to them. By summer, the majority of relevant submissions were including checklists and reviewers were commonly using these to inform their reviews. The informal feedback we have received has been quite positive, with many authors and reviewers commenting on their usefulness. We have also had some negative comments from authors and reviewers who found the requirement burdensome.
- In July we began distributing a survey to authors regarding their use of the checklists. The survey is sent to authors within two weeks of submission and before any editorial decision is made. We have had a 60% response rate. As of 10/20/2016, 314 surveys were returned. Approximately 1/3 of authors responded that the guidelines affected their submission, and approximately 2/3 found it either very or somewhat useful. Most of the changes made as a result of guideline use were in the Methods or Results Sections. We will continue to gather data on the survey, and once we have reached a “steady state” we will study the impact of the initiative on the quality of our published manuscripts.

- RSNA REFRESHER COURSE 2016: In 2015, we began a new RSNA refresher course presented at the annual meeting, “Understanding and Using the STARD and PRISMA Guidelines: Introduction.” The course was well received and will be presented at the 2016 annual meeting as well. We are delighted that Patrick Bossuyt, PhD, the principle architect of the STARD guidelines, and Mathew Mc Innes, MD our 2014 Eyler fellow will join Deborah Levine MD and me in presenting this course.

Herbert Y. Kressel, MD

Editor, *Radiology*