

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

## Ovulation Prevalence in Women with Spontaneous Normal-Length Menstrual Cycles—a population-based cohort from HUNT3, Norway

### JAMA

Submitted: 30-Dec-2013

Decisioned: 09-Jan-2014

Reject without Review (09-Jan-2014)

**Sent:** January 9, 2014 7:14 AM

**To:**

**Cc:** ;

**Subject:** JAMA13-11511 Decision Letter

January 9, 2014

RE: Ovulation Point Prevalence in a Population-based Cohort- Premenopausal women with a spontaneous normal-length cycle from HUNT3 in mid-Norway

Dear Dr. :

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JAMA. Each manuscript is thoroughly evaluated by the JAMA editorial staff, who assess the manuscript's quality and its priority for publication. Those manuscripts judged unlikely to succeed through stringent external review or whose subject matter does not meet our current editorial priorities are rejected at that point.

About half of the approximately 6600 manuscripts submitted to us annually are rejected after such in-house review; less than 9% of manuscripts are eventually accepted for publication in JAMA. Based on our evaluation, I regret to inform you that we will not pursue the manuscript you have submitted for publication, and we will not be referring it to JAMA Internal Medicine.

Table 3 shows that the cohort analyzed is not representative of women of reproductive age, with very few women included who were aged 30 years or younger and a median age of 41.6 years. This is likely due to the large number of younger women using oral contraception. This changes the conclusions that can be made about the broader group of women of reproductive age.

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

While we realize that you may be disappointed with our decision, we hope that providing you with this information promptly will allow you to submit your manuscript to another journal without the delay entailed by the external review process.

Thank you for the privilege of reviewing your work.

Sincerely yours,

Associate Editor, JAMA

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

**NEJM**

Submitted: 20-Mar-2014

Decisioned: 26-Mar-2014

Reject without Review (26-Mar-2014)

**Decision Letter (14-03447)**

**From:**

**To:**

**CC:**

**Subject:** New England Journal of Medicine 14-03447

**Body:** Dear Dr. ,

I am sorry to inform you that your submission, "Ovulation Prevalence in Women with Spontaneous Normal-Length Menstrual Cycles: A Population-based Cohort from HUNT3, Norway," has not been accepted for publication in the Journal. It was evaluated by members of our editorial staff. After considering its focus and content, we made the editorial decision not to consider your submission further. We are informing you of this promptly so that you can submit it elsewhere.

Thank you for the opportunity to consider your submission.

Sincerely yours,

Deputy Editor

New England Journal of Medicine  
10 Shattuck Street  
Boston, MA 02115  
(617) 734-9800  
Fax: (617) 739-9864  
<http://www.nejm.org>

**Date Sent:** 26-Mar-2014

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

**The Lancet**

Submitted: 29-Apr-2014

Decisioned: 06-May-2014

Reject without Review (06-May-2014)

Date: 06/05/2014

To:

From: "The Lancet Peer Review Team"

Subject: Your Submission to The Lancet

Manuscript reference number: THELANCET-D-14-02988

Title: Ovulation Prevalence in Women with Spontaneous Normal-Length Menstrual Cycles — a population-based cohort from HUNT3, Norway

Dear Dr. ,

Many thanks for submitting your manuscript to The Lancet. We have considered your manuscript, but our decision is that it would be better placed elsewhere.

Unfortunately, we can accept only a very small proportion of the many papers we receive each week. We are sorry to be unhelpful on this occasion, though we would like you to think of us again in the future.

Yours sincerely,

Senior Executive Editor, The Lancet

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

**BMJ**

Submitted: 03-Jun-2014

Decisioned: 10-Jun-2014

Reject without Review (10-Jun-2014)

**Decision Letter (BMJ.2014.020530)**

**From:**

**To:**

**CC:**

**Subject:** BMJ.2014.020530 Manuscript Decision Research

**Body:** Dear Dr.

# BMJ.2014.020530 entitled "Ovulation Prevalence in Women with Spontaneous Normal-Length Menstrual Cycles—a population-based cohort from HUNT3, Norway"

Thank you for sending us your paper. We read it with interest but I regret to say that we have decided not to publish it in the BMJ as we felt it lacks direct relevance to patient care or practice.

We receive over 8000 submissions a year and accept less than 10%. We do therefore have to make hard decisions on just how interesting an article will be to our general clinical readers, how much it adds, and how much practical value it will be.

We decided your paper was probably better placed in a more specialist journal. We are sorry to disappoint you and I hope it will not deter you from submitting articles to us in future.

Best wishes

Yours sincerely

If you elected during submission to send your article on to another journal the article will be transferred in 5 working days. If you intend to appeal against this decision please notify us before then.

The journal(s) (if any) you have selected at submission are:

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

If you want to speed up or stop this onward transmission please email the editorial office: [papersadmin@bmj.com](mailto:papersadmin@bmj.com)

**Date Sent:** 10-Jun-2014

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

## **CMAJ**

Submitted: 24-Oct-2014

Decisioned: 04-Dec-2014

Immediate Reject without Review (04-Dec-2014)

### **Decision Letter (CMAJ-14-1374)**

**From:**

**To:**

**CC:**

**Subject:** CMAJ - Decision on Manuscript ID CMAJ-14-1374

**Body:** 04-Dec-2014

Dear Dr.       :

Thank you for giving the CMAJ editors the opportunity to review your manuscript entitled "Ovulation Prevalence in a Population-based Cohort of 3,709 Women, the HUNT Study, Norway" (reference no. CMAJ-14-1374), which you submitted recently to the Journal.

Your manuscript outlines the prevalence of anovulation in a cohort of women in Norway. Knowing the prevalence of anovulation among women of reproductive age could have important consequences for family planning and could help guide clinical practice. Unfortunately, though your finding that over a third of the women in your study were anovulatory at a given point is interesting, the CMAJ editors who carefully read your manuscript felt that your study did not add enough to what is already known to be given priority for publication in the CMAJ at this time.

Each year we receive over a thousand research manuscripts and we have room to publish only about 8% of those submitted. This means we have to reject some good quality manuscripts that are not as suitable for the CMAJ as others that we accept. When deciding upon the acceptability of a manuscript for publication in the CMAJ, the editors consider factors such as its application to medical practice and other manuscripts recently published.

If you think that we have made a mistake in rejecting your manuscript, we are prepared to reconsider the decision through our Appeal process. You can access this process by following the link in the Author Centre in ScholarOne.

Thank you again for giving CMAJ the opportunity to consider your manuscript. I hope that we will be able to give you a more favourable response on a future submission.

Compiled from emails and journal records 2018/01/09 by DK

Sincerely,

Medical Editorial Fellow  
CMAJ

CMAJ – medical knowledge that matters  
CMAJ showcases innovative research and ideas aimed at improving health for people in Canada and globally. It publishes original clinical research, analyses and reviews, news, practice updates and thought-provoking editorials.

**Date Sent:** 04-Dec-2014