



AZVT Editorial Committee Information

The Editorial Committee consists of the Program Co-Chairs along with four Section Chairs. Sections include *Case Studies*, *Hospital Procedures*, *Clinical Pathology*, and *Innovations and Updates*.

The Committee evaluates the submitted topics each year and assesses their validity, timeliness, and merit. They also judge whether or not the topic has been over-represented in recent years. Refer to the **Presentation Title History** document on the Program Committee website (<https://azvt.org/Presentation-Info>).

Assistant Editors help each Section Chair and the Editor-in-Chief in reviewing the content of the submissions after they have been approved by the Editorial Committee. *If you are interested in becoming an Assistant Editor, please contact the Editor-in-Chief (conferenceprogram@AZVT.org).*

There are a limited number of Section Assistant Editor slots, based on the needs of the Section Chairs. Once the Section Assistants are filled, a backup list is created. The backup Assistants help the Editor-in-Chief during the final evaluation stage, unless they are needed to replace a Section Assistant.

If a Section Chair is needed, they are generally chosen from the historical pool of Assistant Editors who have experience editing within AZVT. If you are or want to be an Assistant Editor and have questions, please contact the Editor-in-Chief.

Please note: You must be a current member of AZVT to qualify for any editing position.

Editor Resource Information

AUTHOR INFORMATION

The Author Information packet is provided to authors each year and contains information on the appropriate formatting for the abstract and paper as well as how to write and cite references. Other important information includes how to reference drugs appropriately, the correct method for writing numbers, presenting tables and figures appropriately, and how the paper should be organized.

The Author Information packet will be helpful to any editor (Section Chair or Assistant) as it provides the required guidelines for the authors and helps editors understand what is expected from each abstract/paper.

The most current information is presented in the Author Information packet.

PRESENTATION TITLE HISTORY

The Presentation Title History document has the most current information about titles of presentations, posters, round table discussions, and wet labs/workshops from past years as a reference for future presentations.

Some topics become popular and are often submitted frequently. In the interest of keeping things fresh and sharing new information, the Editorial Committee will evaluate the submitted topic and evaluate whether or not it has been presented too much in the recent past.

If a topic has been covered frequently in the recent past, the author may be asked to rethink their subject matter – for instance, consider a different format for presenting their topic (e.g. discussing/presenting on a disease using a medical case as an example) or they will be asked to wait for another year.

BEST PAPER

Beginning in 2015, the members attending the conference no longer vote on the best paper, but instead vote on the best presentation. The Best Paper will be determined through a vote by the Editorial Committee (Program Co-Chairs and Section Editors). Each Section Chair nominates one paper from their section. Requirements are:

1. Author has met *all* of the publication deadlines
2. The submission is of high-quality and value to the AZVT membership

Section Chairs and Program Co-Chairs will vote among the qualified submissions and the submission with the most votes will receive the Best Paper Award.

The author of the Best Paper Award receives recognition at the meeting as well as \$100.

Editorial Process

The general editing process for the annual conference is listed. Please keep deadlines and dates in mind – the RACE program application must be submitted two months ahead of the conference, otherwise AZVT pays a late fee.

1. Section Chairs are confirmed and the number of Assistant Editors Requested is finalized.
2. Call for Assistant Editors is sent out to the AZVT membership
 - a. *Positions are filled on a first come, first served basis*
 - b. *Please indicate which section you would like to edit*
 - i. *NOTE: You may not get the section you request, particularly if you will be presenting at the Annual Conference*
3. Submission Form and resume/CV are due by the designated due date
 - a. *Information for editors is sent out around this deadline*
4. The Editorial Committee evaluates the submissions. Authors are contacted within two weeks whether their topic has been approved, approved with suggested edits/comments, or rejected
 - a. Authors with “approved with suggested edits/comments” will work with the Editor-in-Chief to finalize their particular topic
 - b. Authors with “rejected” topics can work with the Editor-in-Chief to reevaluate their topic for approval
 - c. Once approved, an email will be sent with details about section assignments
 - i. *NOTE: If a certain section has an overabundance of submissions, submissions may end up with a Section Chair from another section - This is so that one person does not bear the burden of reviewing the majority of the submissions*
5. Abstracts will be due to either the Editor-in-Chief or the Section Chair on or before the due date
 - a. **Authors will be working directly with their Section Chair**
 - i. Any Abstracts received by the Editor-in Chief prior to the deadline will be sent to the appropriate Section Chair – *Please confirm receipt of the Abstract with your Author*
 - b. Section Chairs will send abstracts to their Assistant Editors for their review
 - i. *Details of this process are up to the individual Section Chair*

- ii. **ASSISTANT EDITORS SHOULD NEVER CONTACT AN AUTHOR DIRECTLY – ALL EDITS SHOULD GO THROUGH THE SECTION CHAIR**
 - 1. *This is to minimize confusion for both the Author and the Editor*
 - c. Edits will be compiled by the Section Chair and sent to the Author for approval or rejection
 - i. *If edits are rejected, an explanation should be provided so that everyone understands the reasons*
 - ii. *This could be considered an area for more clarity or explanation for future readers*
 - d. Approved/rejected edits sent back to Section Chair for evaluation
 - e. Process continues until all parties are satisfied
 - f. **If only an Abstract is being submitted**, the final Abstract is sent to the Editor-in-Chief by the Section Chair (see #6)
6. First Drafts of full papers will be due to the Section Chair on or before the due date
- a. Section Chairs will send full papers to their Assistant Editors for their review
 - i. *This will include the Abstract, so this does not need to be submitted to the Editor-in-Chief until the Full Paper has been edited*
 - b. Edits will be compiled and sent to the Author for approval or rejection
 - i. *If edits are rejected, an explanation should be provided*
 - ii. *Please consider this an area that may require further clarification or details*
 - c. Approved/rejected edits sent back to Section Chair for evaluation
 - d. Process continues until all parties are satisfied
 - i. *There is a Second Draft deadline – the Author should provide at least a second draft of their full paper, with edits taken into account, by this date*
 - e. Final drafts will be evaluated and reviewed by the Editor-in-Chief and their Assistant Editor in much the same manner as above.
 - i. *Editor-in-Chief will be incorporated into the editing process at some point prior to the Final Deadline.*
7. Final draft of the full paper should be submitted on or before the due date. Section Chairs should submit the final draft to the Editor-in-Chief.
- a. **THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD BE THE FINAL, EDITED, AND AGREED-UPON DOCUMENT – NO FURTHER EDITING SHOULD BE NECESSARY**
 - b. *A confirmation email will be sent out to acknowledge receipt of the final draft.*
8. The final, agreed upon version of the paper or abstract will appear in the proceedings.
-

Suggestions for Editing

These items represent just a few items that should be considered when editing. It is not a comprehensive list.

1. Mechanics

- a. Includes grammar, spelling, punctuation
 - i. Make sure these are correct. Sometimes related sentences can be combined using a semicolon, which helps with the flow of sentences.
 - ii. Try and make sure that the same word is not being used in the same sentence or in immediately adjacent sentences (unless the word is referring to something specific that is necessary for the topic)
 1. The thesaurus is a great resource for thinking about new words!

2. Order of topics

- a. Think about how the information is being presented – would it make more sense to reorganize the order to make it more understandable?

3. Drugs are referenced correctly

- a. Be sure the generic name is listed
- b. Be sure the dose by weight is listed (in metric units)
- c. Be sure the name and location (city/state/zip or country is listed)

4. Products are referenced correctly

- a. First consider if naming the product is absolutely necessary – is it important to the content of the paper? If not, perhaps it is not needed.
- b. If needed, include copyright, trademark, or registered for the product name
- c. Be sure the name and location (city/state/zip or country is listed)

5. References are cited (Name Year) and referenced correctly

- a. See the Author Information packet for details about reference formatting
- b. Make sure there is a *citation for every reference*, and a *reference for every citation*
- c. If the author is using a type of resource that is not listed in the Author Information, contact the Editor-in-Chief, who has the CSE Style Manual and will likely be able to help clarify

6. Suggestion about references:

- a. The authors are ultimately responsible for their references
- b. If you are familiar with a journal article or other resource that could be useful to the author, you are encouraged to send it, but *keep in mind that they are in the middle of writing this paper and adding more resources could become overwhelming*
 - i. Some authors will appreciate this, others may find it frustrating
 - ii. Limit the number of resources you choose to send – more will just increase frustration
- c. In general, generic web pages and blogs are NOT good resources
 - i. However, the context of the submission/topic should be taken into consideration when evaluating these type of resources – for instance a blog from an organization that the author worked with in the field may be a valid contextualizing resource
- d. Wikipedia is NEVER a good resource

7. Plagiarism

- a. Plagiarism can be complicated, but some basic definitions:
 - i. Direct quotes (verbatim, word-for-word writings from a resource should be identified using

quotation marks (“”) and include the Author Year and a page number – if not, this is plagiarism

- ii. Concepts, procedures, theories, and other ideas that are not ‘common knowledge’ but come from other people should also be referenced
 1. If these are not presented verbatim the idea still must be cited/referenced as the idea does not belong to the author and must be referred back to the ‘owner’ so to speak.
- b. This can be a difficult situation to identify as we are not using plagiarism software and it is next to impossible for editors to read through papers and verify that there is no plagiarism occurring
 - i. There are some plagiarism detection resources out there, including Grammarly (<https://www.grammarly.com/plagiarism-checker>) and Plagiarism Checker (<https://plagiarismdetector.net/>) as just two examples – or you can Google certain sections of a paper
- c. Some hints (very general and not in depth)
 - i. If you are reading and the wording in a certain section feels or reads differently compared to the previous writing, consider copying the text into Google (use quotation marks around the section to make the search engine look for the entire content, rather than just individual words) to see if something comes up
 - ii. If there is a statement that suggests some fact or concept (or something that makes you say – hey, I didn’t know that... where did they get that information?), that may be a good place for a reference. If one is not there, it could be plagiarism (see 7.a.ii) – encourage the author to cite their resource

8. Author Voice

- a. Remember that this paper is the author’s intellectual activity and ultimately their intellectual property and their voice should be maintained as much as possible throughout the editing process
- b. Sometimes reorganizing/rewording sentences and paragraphs may be useful in conveying their meaning, without changing their voice
- c. Questions for the author about what they mean could help guide them to change their phrasing – these can offer the author opportunities to think about what they are trying to convey
- d. While sometimes a complete overhaul of a paper could be necessary due to grammar, spelling, or content issues, the author will need to be actively involved in the process.
 - i. Authors should have the ability to discuss any changes and reject them if they do not like the change – again these are opportunities for the author to consider the clarity of their writing and allow them to participate in the process, rather than being a bystander

9. Involving the Editor-in-Chief

- a. Section Chairs should plan to involve the Editor-in-Chief near the end of their editing process, but not after the Section Chair has called the paper ‘finalized’
- b. The Editor-in-Chief will continue the editing process, reviewing the submission further to verify the final details
 - i. Note that it is frustrating to authors if they think they are ‘done’ but then have to go through another editing process
- c. Do involve the Editor-in-Chief at any time if there is a major concern or problem to respond to!