



# Transparency in the Publication Etiquette of Open Research and Reviews

## Scientific and Technical Advisory Council [STAC], of the Special Journals Publisher [SJP]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Citation:**

Scientific and Technical Advisory Council (STAC) of the Special Journals Publisher (SJP): Transparency in the publication etiquette of Open Research and Reviews. Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews [SJ-ORR], 2020; 1 (1):1- 4

Correspondence: [editorialoffice@spparenet.org](mailto:editorialoffice@spparenet.org)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Background**

The topic of transparency is a mirage or a paradox because the minimum acceptable measurable transparency standard remains highly debated. The key issue is how to make sure all stakeholders both within and outside Special Journals Publisher sees and understands the goal of Special Journals Publisher [SJP] in the same way (1). To achieve this, there is a regular training or orientation or alignment of stakeholders'

ideologies, perceptions, and/or success in organized workshops, seminars, and symposia. This may be the panacea for the frictions to the free flow, acceptance, and uptake of information or instructions.

**Communication and transparency in Open Research and Reviews (2)**

It is good communication of relevant Open Research and Reviews information to

stakeholders that defines the measure of transparency. Special Journals Publisher develops and sticks to a defined model of communication to stakeholders such as readers, authors, reviewers of Open Research and Review papers including the rank and file of the publisher's team. Effective communication is key to adequate Open Research and Reviews information management which also is the key to the success of a result-oriented Special Journals Publisher. Adequate Open Research and Reviews information management can be supported by a community of practice that has equal perception and understanding of the short- and long-term goals of Special Journals Publisher. A publisher's community of practice may entail all the publishing teams including the professional, technical, management, and support teams working in tandem towards the achievement of the overall goal of publishing a quality Open Research and Reviews database

Transparency also requires a publishing culture that welcomes honest, open communication (3) between different levels of Special Journals Publisher settings. This will require trust and an unspoken rule of positive feedback and constructive criticism. When the trust and confidence of Open Research and Reviews editors are won, then there will be a spontaneous unregulated release of their inner gifted potentials which Special Journals Publisher needs to excel. To achieve transparency in Open Research and Reviews database publishing, all boiling or debated opinions must be avoided and we can have a flawless communication system when Open Research and Reviews Editorial team can express their concerns or opinions.

### **Mistakes and transparency in Open Research and Reviews**

Transparency in dealing with any publishing mistakes will help both stakeholders to be on the same page without being misunderstood or quoted out of context (4). Authors, reviewers, and publishers must understand the policies regarding what it takes to publish any Open Research and Reviews manuscript for the public gaze. If Open Research and Reviews authors know the policy behind all decisions and how it is implemented, they will be ready to welcome any decision whether good or bad without the feeling of being alienated and discriminated against. The reason for rejection and/or acceptance of the Open Research and Reviews paper must be well articulated. The availability and use of a simple user-friendly system to evaluate errors or mistakes in Open Research and Reviews are central to our overall strategy to achieve transparency in our decision making (5) in the publishing of Open Research and Reviews. Upon acceptance of Open Research and Review papers before publishing, we prepare the galley proof by subjecting the papers to stringent analysis for error-free content using standard software.

### **Translation of transparency values into action (6) in Open Research and Reviews**

Special Journals Publisher uses a system, that ensures that the transparency value gets translated into action for editors to know the direction it is going. Some harder questions can better be articulated by the top managers to ensure the public has a clear and brief knowledge of the organization's mission and vision. Changes are communicated to stakeholders from time to time to build trust and uplift their morale. Special Journals Publisher has a system that creates a publishing workplace where the editorial team works together in tandem

towards the same result. Every good action they take will, in some way, be tied to one common goal of establishing a database that depicts excellence beyond expectation and for the greater good of the Special Journals Publisher

### **Feedback and transparency in Open Research and Reviews**

Stakeholders' feedback (7) is a great way to tell the Editorial team of the Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews that their opinions matter. Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews [SJ-ORR] will hold regular performance conversations to let the Editorial team have the opportunity to share new updates and changes with stakeholders and to let the stakeholders including authors and reviewers to ask for clarification or make suggestions on sensitive issues about the publishing policies of the journal. Editorial team performance shows stakeholders that the team receives their opinions and that we're willing to listen to their ideas.

### **Negative feedback and transparency (8) in Open Research and Reviews**

The feedback principle requires that all stakeholders are informed about both the positive and negative news about the Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews [SJ-ORR]. It's important to share positive challenges, and accomplishments and it's equally important to keep stakeholders updated concerning challenges, and obstacles, militating the achievement of stated goals. The fear that bad news could put a hindrance on the publishing culture should be eroded by the fact that sharing the ups and downs can create a sense of unity and inspire the unity of the Editorial committee for good.

### **Transparency and loss Management in Open Research and Reviews**

When we lose a major partner or stakeholder that affects our ability to achieve our objectives, our policy is to announce it in a way that could encourage positive action (9). Instead of dropping the news just like that, or adopting the blame game, or pointing fingers, Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews will say that the recent change in clientele was as an opportunity to thank the account holders for their hard work, go over our recovery plans, and open the floor for new and future business discussion. Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews set new goals; offer incentives and dish out plenty of encouragement to keep stakeholders' morale high.

### **Morale boost and transparency (10) in Open Research and Reviews**

Giving our Editorial team transparency, trust, and accountability can be a tricky balancing act. While the Editorial team might not be enough to get the work done, asking for too much transparency may lead to creativity drainage and editorial team redundancy. To preserve trust and morale, the Editorial team needs transparency in two areas: what they need to achieve and how they go about achieving it. The team will need to tailor its accountability system to address these two areas based on their roles and goals.

### **Conclusion**

Unity of purpose, and ideologies, with a clearly defined agenda, is the best way to achieve publishing excellence beyond expectation in a result-oriented press. Team

playing use of edifying and morale-boosting language to communicate losses and giving stakeholders opportunity to air their views before final decisions are made as well as timely communication of the final decisions to stakeholder forms the bases of transparency in the publication etiquette of Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews

## Reference

1. Nieder TO, Koehler A, Briken P, Eyssel J. Mapping key stakeholders' position towards interdisciplinary transgender healthcare: A stakeholder analysis. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2020 Mar;28(2):385-395.
2. Spalluto LB, Planz VB, Stokes LS, Pierce R, Aronoff DM, McPheeters ML, Omary RA. Transparency and Trust During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2020 Jul;17(7):909-912.
3. Glauser W. Communication, transparency key as Canada faces new coronavirus threat. *CMAJ*. 2020 Feb 18;192(7): E171-E172.
4. Elmore SA, Weston EH. Predatory Journals: What They Are and How to Avoid Them. *Toxicol Pathol*. 2020 Jun;48(4):607-610.
5. Felzmann H, Fosch-Villaronga E, Lutz C, Tamò-Larrieux A. Towards Transparency by Design for Artificial Intelligence. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2020 Dec;26(6):3333-3361.
6. Vian T. Anti-corruption, transparency, and accountability in health: concepts, frameworks, and approaches. *Glob Health Action*. 2020;13(sup1):1694744
7. Coleman EA, Manyindo J, Parker AR, Schultz B. Stakeholder engagement increases transparency, satisfaction, and civic action. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019 Dec 3;116(49):24486-24491.
8. Gnepp J, Klayman J, Williamson IO, Barlas S. The future of feedback: Motivating performance improvement through future-focused feedback. *PLoS One*. 2020 Jun 19;15(6):e0234444.
9. Norris JM, White DE, Nowell L, Mrklas K, Stelfox HT. How do stakeholders from multiple hierarchical levels of a large provincial health system define engagement? A qualitative study. *Implement Sci*. 2017 Aug 1;12(1):98.
10. Sharma P. The importance of team morale. *BDJ Team*. 2021;8(1):22–3. Epub 2021 Jan 15.

Submit your papers for publication to Special Journal of Open Research and Reviews [SJ-ORR] online below

<https://sjorr.spparenet.org/submit/> or by

email attachment to us at

[editorialoffice@spparenet.org](mailto:editorialoffice@spparenet.org)