Reviewer’s report

Title: Core Competencies for Scientific Editors of Biomedical Journals: Consensus Statement

Version: 0 Date: 08 May 2017

Reviewer: Dominique Griffon

Reviewer’s report:

This study addresses a topic that is widely relevant to all scientific journals and remains poorly investigated. The manuscript is well written and concise.

Regarding the methodology, the criteria for inclusion of experts should be expanded. These are not clearly defined in the manuscript. Ideally, a set of criteria should have been predetermined and a general call to experts sent. The authors disclose the type of audience that they targeted but the method to recruit and select them is not clear, nor is their relative representation on the group studied. This is very relevant since the study relies entirely on the opinion of this group.

I also have some concern regarding the originality and impact of this study. The authors do not clearly state the new knowledge that their consensus study generated. For example, they do not compare and contrast their findings, with their previous literature review. Similarly, comparing their results with those of the online survey would improve the scientific content of their work. The discussion ends with a long-term goal of developing a curriculum to train scientific editors, but they do not discuss in details how the findings of their study will impact this goal. It appears that some competencies (For example, competency 5.1 :Demonstrate skill, tact, diplomacy...) relate more to individual characteristics (ie selection process) than curricular goal. The discussion is very short and could be expanded with depth of thought on: 1- rationale behind these competencies (were they expected? Why do they matter?) and 2- implementation / impact of these findings.
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