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In cascade or waterfall peer-review system, the reviewers’ comments are shared during resubmission of the manuscript to a different, more suitable journal belonging to the same publishing group. The transferred journal is usually of a lower reputation or has a lower impact factor. A free consultation by the publisher is often provided to the authors. The publisher has the advantage of retaining good content within their pool of publications. Considering this option, many publishers maintain a uniform manuscript structuring, and formatting across their journals.

The publisher should have an adequate number of journals with overlapping or at least, partially overlapping interests. For example, a manuscript on gastrointestinal radiology may be of common interest to journals of radiology, interventional radiology, gastroenterology, and clinical gastroenterology. A broad specialty journal should have specific subsections for easy identification and navigation through the journal. Careful selection of keywords also will be useful. A good rapport and understanding among editorial boards would facilitate a smooth exchange process.

Another strategic advantage of cascade peer-review system is retaining the first submission date while resubmitting to another journal within the publishing group. This aids in retaining seniority while claiming credits to their ideas. In this digital era, we should be able to maximize available opportunities for authors, publishers, and readers. Everyone’s time and effort should be valued. Perhaps, portability of the manuscripts would enhance the publication possibility of good material as some authors would “give up” especially if they under-rate their own work. In addition, this would reduce review junk. Overall, this results in a win-win situation.
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