

Notes meeting editorial board 23rd March 2023

Present: Helena Liira (F), Mikael Ekblad (F), Torunn Bjerve Eide (N), Linda Huibers (DK), Anna Mygind (DK), Anna Nager (S), Cecilia Björkelund (S), Hálfván Pétursson (IS), Jørgen Nexøe (DK)

Minutes: Anna Mygind

1. Everyone presented themselves
2. Discussion of the current situation
 - a. Uniformity of review process across countries
 - i. Editor-in-chief does the pre-selection. Then the national/ass.nation editor reads the paper – a good idea to take notes when you read the paper for the first time – assess whether to pass on to reviewers or reject. When reviewer assessments come back, the editor could check with the previously produced notes.
 - ii. The editors may send the paper back to the editor-in-chief.
 - iii. When considering whether to send the paper in review, the editor should focus on: is this new, is it relevant, is it 'true' (does it conclude right) – and then trust the reviewers.
 - iv. If two reviewers reject, then the paper should be rejected.
 - v. Communication with authors: goes usually (always?) between the EIC and the author (then write in notes if you have extra information for the author)
 - b. Finding reviewers
 - i. Good to have someone from the country of origin + from abroad.
 - ii. Could the authors suggest reviewers – perhaps ask the author for suggestions if you cannot find a reviewer?
 - iii. Our reviewer selections in the system are not good – use instead google scholar, PubMed or people you know.
 - iv. When do we give up finding reviewers? After 6 months – then perhaps ask the author for suggestions.
 - v. Could T&F provide possibilities to improve the suggested reviewers?
 - vi. Anna will ask Alexandra if it could be an idea to give a discount in the publication fee if one has reviewed a paper.
 - vii. Remember that also younger researchers (PhD students) can review.
 - viii. How can we tell our colleagues more about the need to review?
 - c. Rejections
 - i. Rejection rates: 60 out of 300 are accepted – approx. 10-15 % of the papers sent to reviewers are rejected
 - ii. If papers are too long or have too many references, it should not be sent into review – can T&F help?
 - iii. As editor you may recommend to resubmit (with directions) instead of sending it in review
 - d. The editor's role

- i. What to do if we see things that should be improved? We may provide suggestions, but it is not expected from the editors. Also good idea to suggest citing relevant SJPHC papers
 - ii. References: the editor's role is to take a glance at the refs, we cannot check them
 - iii. If the suggested corrections are not followed, the editors may send it to the EIC who may reject
 - iv. Good idea to use the 'notes' box for communication between editors
 - v. Importance: Keep a good speed in the review process (as good as possible, it often takes time to find reviewers)
- 3. Differences between national and national assistant editors
 - a. Should all be national editors? The history is that the job is rather different for national and assistant national editors. Now the task is similar, and more papers are expected to need editorial work, so it should be more equal. There was agreement that all should be national editors.
 - b. At least Norway, Sweden and Denmark need three editors, Finland and Iceland need two editors, since they are smaller countries with not so many papers.
 - c. What should be the 'carrot' for being an editor? We shared ideas:
 - i. Everybody should be invited to the annual Copenhagen March/April meeting
 - ii. Paid fee for the Nordic Congress
 - iii. Fun trips – canoeing etc
 - iv. Fall meeting in the year with no Nordic congress
 - v. Payments – and if so, how much?
 - vi. Increasing number of papers and increasing publication fee – must give some extra funding
 - vii. The college's responsibility for the journal
 - d. Helena and Anna N will discuss it with the board on Friday.
- 4. Waivers – invitations to publications without publication fees – we have 10 this year (submission within this year)
 - a. Ideas:
 - i. Opinion papers
 - ii. Core values
 - iii. Methodological papers
 - iv. Descriptions of healthcare systems
 - v. Descriptions of registries
 - vi. Think of those finishing their PhDs – maybe they have an idea for an opinion paper or similar
 - vii. Clinical themes
 - viii. Could we use the teams platform for sharing ideas?
 - ix. How to do clinical research – and obstacles, ethics, GDPR etc.
 - x. History of medical history in the Nordic countries
 - xi. How to promote research in regional networks, and how to make primary care research possible in the primary care context – how to collaborate
 - b. How should the decision be made? We decided that each country decides on two papers, deadline 1st July 2023. Send the suggestions to Anna N by then.

- c. These papers should probably be excluded from the 'paper of the year' process
- 5. Paper of the year
 - a. End of Jan: EIC checks the papers of the previous year, identifies the five papers with most citations and openings. These candidates are presented to a panel, maybe one from each Nordic country. Discussions at the Spring meeting and presented at the Nordic congress.
- 6. Four issues per year or continuous publications?
 - a. T&F suggests not grouping in issues
 - b. We discussed pros and cons
 - c. Anna N will ask Alexandra about this
- 7. Focus on general practice / primary healthcare
 - a. Should papers with no or limited relation to general practice be accepted in SJPHC? We discussed whether to have restrictions in terms of:
 - i. Having authors who are primary care clinicians?
 - ii. Having authors who are members of the college?
 - iii. Relevance to general practice and/or primary healthcare?
 - b. No decisions made.
- 8. Next editorial meeting
 - a. We will decide this on Teams or editorial meeting
 - b. If we have problems joining the Teams group, please contact Anna N
- 9. Editorials
 - a. The plan for 2023
 - i. 1 Nov 2022: Iceland
 - ii. 1 Feb 2023: Helena and Anna (usually Norway)
 - iii. 1 May 2023: Denmark
 - iv. 1 Aug 2023: Finland
 - v. 1 Nov 2023: Sweden
 - b. This plan is repeated every year. Each group of national editors decides who to write the editorial. Keep in mind that citing papers from the current year does not affect the impact factor.