

Personal Manuscript Acceptance Rates - Novel Metrics for Self-Assessment in Scholarship

Andrew H. Slattengren, DO

Assistant Professor, Associate Program Director

University of Minnesota Medical School

North Memorial Family Medicine Residency



Family Medicine and Community Health

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Driven to DiscoverSM

Special Thanks

Mike Pitt, MD, FAAP

Associate Professor University of Minnesota Medical School, Department of Pediatrics

- Associate Chair of Faculty Development
- Associate Residency Program Director
- Director of Global Health Education



Family Medicine and Community Health

Deborah Finstad

Evaluation and Statistics Hub Manager, Research Services
University of Minnesota Medical School, Department of
Family Medicine and Community Health

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Driven to DiscoverSM

Disclosures

- I have no relevant financial relationship or interest with a proprietary entity producing, marketing, reselling or distributing health care goods or services.
- *This program does not include any discussion or demonstration of any pharmaceuticals or medical devices that are not approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or that are considered “off-label.”*

Objectives

Upon completion of this session, participants should be able to:

- Describe the benefits of measuring personal manuscript acceptance rates as tools to put their own evolving experiences with manuscript submissions in context.
- Calculate their personal acceptance rate per submission (ARPS) and eventual acceptance rate (ERA).
- Track the novel metrics, ARPS and ERA, over time as a method of self-assessment.

Background

How do I deal with manuscript rejection?

What percentage of manuscripts should I expect to get rejected?

Is my experience normal?



RESEARCHER SUPPORT

[Researcher Support Home](#)

[Copyright and Fair Use](#)

[Data Management](#)

[Digital Arts Sciences + Humanities \(DASH\)](#)

RESEARCH GROUP/DEPARTMENT IMPACT MEASURES

A research group or department may wish to gauge the impact of its research or learn how it compares to its peers. Similar to individual impact measures, these numbers can give only a partial story of impact.

On this page:

- [Publication Activity and Citation Count](#)
- [Group h-index](#)
- [US News & World Report Rankings](#)

Contact Your Subject Specialist

For questions and further information, contact your [subject librarian](#).

How do I rank compared to others at the University of Minnesota DFMCH?

	h-Index	h(fl)- Index	Total Publications	First/Last Author Publications	Total Citations	First/Last Author Citations
Me	2	3	18	12	217	5
Dept Mean	3	2	7	3.5	40	11

Background

- Common publication metrics rely on enough time to pass to accumulate citations.
- They do **little to provide self-assessment** early in one's academic career.
- As they can only go up over time, the **lack of fluctuation provides little real-time feedback** for academicians.

*Hirsch et al. 2005,
Carpenter et al. 2014, Kelly et al. 2007*

Background

- Other than successful publications, academic departments have few tools to assess individual faculty members' **efforts and the challenges** along the way (e.g. **rejections**).
- This **limits the ability to provide useful mentoring** to faculty who are early in their research careers.

Woolley et al. 2009, DeCastro et al. 2013

Background


Rejection is faced by all researchers, yet **that initial rejection can dissuade some from pursuing other avenues** to disseminate their findings.

*Day et al. 2011, Ray et al. 2000,
Venketasubraanian et al. 2013, Campanario et al. 2007*

We had a question...

Can we de-stigmatize rejection?

We had an idea 

 **measure individual metrics related to manuscript submissions**

 **compare those to others within their department and in their academic center**

Study Time!

This cross-section survey pilot study was done to determine the feasibility of obtaining novel metrics in academics.

Business Info

- The University of Minnesota Internal Review Board reviewed the study and determined that this study meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review.
- We have no funding at this time to report.

Who was invited to complete the survey?

- Academic clinical faculty in the Department of Family Medicine and Community Health at the University of Minnesota.
- Academic clinical faculty in the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Minnesota.
- Between 0 and 20 manuscripts listed in Scopus in the 2 years prior to the survey.

What was in the survey?

- We provided each faculty with a list of these manuscript titles and asked for the number of unique journals submissions each manuscript required prior to acceptance.
- Allowed authors to **list peer-reviewed manuscripts not indexed** in Scopus and provide the same metrics, as well manuscripts which have been submitted but not yet been accepted by a journal.

What metrics did we calculate?

- **Eventual Rate of Acceptance (ERA):** percent of manuscripts submitted that eventually got accepted by a journal
[1 means all manuscripts submitted were eventually published]
- **Acceptance Rate Per Submission (ARPS):** percent of the time a manuscript is accepted for any given submission to a journal
[1 means all manuscripts were accepted on the first attempt]

Results

- Sixty-Eight (50%) faculty completed the questionnaire
 - 3 excluded for having no scholarship submitted
 - 2 excluded for having 0% clinical time
- Most (41; 65%) were assistant professors
 - Similar to our makeup in the medical school

	Assistant Professor (n = 41)	Associate Professor (n = 11)	Professor (n = 11)	Total (n = 63)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Eventual Acceptance Rate (ERA)	.77 (.27)	.88 (.18)	.81 (.29)	.80 (.26)
Acceptance Rate Per Submissions (ARPS)	.60 (.35)	.71 (.23)	.53 (.33)	.61 (.30)
Acceptance Gap	.17 (.16)	.16 (.17)	.28 (.24)	.19 (.19)

Results

- **The mean Eventual Rate of Acceptance (ERA) was 0.80**
- **Acceptance Rate Per Submission (ARPS) was 0.61**
- **Associate professors had the highest per submission acceptance rate (0.71) and ERA (0.88)**

Conclusions

- **Academic clinicians in our sample eventually published 80% of the papers submitted in the last two years, with a 61% success rate per submission.**
- **Rejection is common among academic clinicians in our sample.**

Conclusions

- **These may prove valuable as self-assessment metrics instead of traditional publication metrics that require citations to accumulate in order to be meaningful.**

Conclusions

- **It was feasible for faculty to report their experiences with rejection using these novel metrics.**
- **Retrospectively collecting data is cumbersome**

What's Next?

- We are currently assessing a platform that allows for personal tracking of manuscripts at the time of submission with academic clinical faculty, fellows and residents in the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Minnesota.
- Positive Peer-Pressured Productivity (P-QUAD)
 - Participants earn points for various degrees of productivity
 - 1 point for abstract submissions
 - 2 points for poster acceptance
 - 3 points for platform presentation

What's Next?

- This information will be shared with faculty members, department research personnel and leadership.
- Incorporate into faculty performance reviews and mentoring sessions in the coming years?

Questions?

- Thank You!

Andrew Slattengren, DO: aslatten@umn.edu

[@broadwaydo](#)