

We're listening

Howard A. Rockman

JCI Insight. 2018;3(2):e99456. <https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.99456>.

Editorial

JCI Insight was launched January 2016 as a second journal published by the American Society for Clinical Investigation. Its purpose is to fill a growing need by the membership to publish high-quality biomedical research at an earlier stage of mechanistic depth than typically seen in the Society's flagship journal, the JCI. While we entered this endeavor with a bit of uncertainty and viewed this as an "ASCI experiment," I can now say with certitude that it has been a resounding success. In case you are wondering, here are the 2-year data: we've published 640 papers, received 572 direct submissions and 566 transfers from JCI, and our average time to decision for reviewed manuscripts is 21 days. When I was Editor of JCI, we surveyed the membership on a broad range of topics. A recurring theme raised by many authors and members was the length of time papers spent in the review process, the large number of experiments frequently requested by reviewers (felt excessive by many authors), and a desire to have our Editors be more proactive in guiding authors with their revisions. It was largely based on this feedback that we decided to start JCI Insight. Well, the results are in. In a recent survey completed by 172 authors who submitted their paper to JCI Insight, 95% felt that the [...]

Find the latest version:

<https://jci.me/99456/pdf>



We're listening

JCI Insight was launched January 2016 as a second journal published by the American Society for Clinical Investigation. Its purpose is to fill a growing need by the membership to publish high-quality biomedical research at an earlier stage of mechanistic depth than typically seen in the Society's flagship journal, the *JCI*. While we entered this endeavor with a bit of uncertainty and viewed this as an "ASCI experiment," I can now say with certitude that it has been a resounding success. In case you are wondering, here are the 2-year data: we've published 640 papers, received 572 direct submissions and 566 transfers from *JCI*, and our average time to decision for reviewed manuscripts is 21 days.

When I was Editor of *JCI*, we surveyed the membership on a broad range of topics. A recurring theme raised by many authors and members was the length of time papers spent in the review process, the large number of experiments frequently requested by reviewers (felt excessive by many authors), and a desire to have our Editors be more proactive in guiding authors with their revisions.

It was largely based on this feedback that we decided to start *JCI Insight*. Well, the results are in. In a recent survey completed by 172 authors who submitted their paper to *JCI Insight*, 95% felt that the revisions we requested were clear, reasonable, and resulted in improving their work; 90% thought that the Editors properly weighed the reviewers' comments and overruled if necessary; approximately 70% felt that the time from acceptance to publication was better than other journals; and 80% said they would submit to *JCI Insight* again. We listen!

Many of the comments we received confirmed our suspicion that authors wanted their best biomedical discoveries featured in a journal where the peer review and publication process is respectful, timely, and efficient. Just a small sample of the comments we received from you as to why you chose *JCI Insight* attest to this point: "The fact that *JCI Insight* publishes high-quality manuscripts dedicated to pathophysiological studies"; "Ease of transfer, and a promise to process the review and making a decision quickly"; "Reputation of JCI ensures that it will be a quality journal"; "Broad clinical appeal for translational research"; "The decision to submit to *JCI Insight* was based upon the high quality of articles published in the journal."

It also highlights how much thought, preparation, and dedication the entire ASCI staff and our in-house publishing unit put into setting up *JCI Insight* right from its inception. Comments that reflect this point are: "The quality publications and seamless integration with the initial JCI manuscript review"; "The speed of publication — not having to go through another round of reviews"; "Transfer was straightforward."

And, I cannot be prouder of my Editorial team (<https://insight.jci.org/kiosks/editorial-board>), who dedicate an enormous effort to the careful reading of your paper, its reviews, and providing constructive and thoughtful feedback to the authors that we feel will improve upon your work. A few comments from our authors illustrate this effort: "I've always been in favor of the JCI policy of limiting reviewers to KEY points needing to be addressed"; "The assigned editor from *JCI Insight* requesting for transfer from *JCI* gave us thoughtful comments about our manuscript, which made me feel that the review process would be thoughtful and timely as well as maintain high standards"; "It is rare that an editor proactively demonstrates interest — had that not occurred — we absolutely would have sent the paper elsewhere"; "Continue the good work, try to limit extensive revisions that take more than 6 months and usually do not add much to the paper."

We will not rest on our laurels. Our goals for the next year are to continue to innovate and improve on the quality of peer review and the publication process. We look forward to working with you and hope that you consider *JCI Insight* for your proudest discoveries. And as always, we welcome your feedback.

On behalf of the *JCI Insight* Editorial Board,

Howard A. Rockman

Editor in Chief

Published: January 25, 2018

Reference information:

JCI Insight. 2018;3(2):e99456.

[https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.](https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.99456)

[insight.99456.](https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.99456)