Initial submission by author team

- AME, IS and Methodologist undertake internal review
- Manuscript returned to team if standards are not met
- Team may undertake several revisions of draft at this stage
- Co-Eds sign off for peer review

Initial checks include

- ⇒ Headings activated
- ⇒ Validation report
- ⇒ Search date valid update needed?
- ⇒ Study flow diagram
- ⇒ Studies correctly allocated
- ⇒ MECIR/Handbook standards met
- ⇒ Plagiarism check

Peer review comments

- AME collates peer review comments and resolves any queries/conflicts before sending to author team
- Conflict of interest forms may be updated
- Revised draft responding to PR comments submitted by authors

Peer reviewers (for reviews)

- ⇒ Usually a Key clinical editor, one other clinical, one consumer, stats/ methods expert
- ⇒ If review is complex, may seek addition PR from the Complex Methods
 Unit, LSR team, RoB2 experts

Post peer review

- Responses to PR comments checked
- ME undertakes consistency checks
- Co-Eds may request revisions before sign off for copy edit
- Authors create dissemination strategy

Post peer review

⇒ Manuscript returned to authors sometimes multiple times—if PR comments are inadequately addressed or if ME finds consistency issues

Manuscript to Copyedit team

- Comments from Copy editor referred to review team for action
- Final quality screen by the MOSS Associate Editor

Copy edit

- ⇒ Copyedit done according to the Cochrane Style Guide
- ⇒ Associate Editor's essential comments must be addressed

Review signed off by Co-Eds

Publication

⇒ May be delayed if author Conflict of interest forms are not up to date or if conflicts have to be referred to the Funding Arbiter