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**Making an impact**

At Nature Climate Change we reject around 80% of primary research manuscripts without review – the majority of systematic reviews and meta-analysis papers are submitted as primary research. This is common across all of the Nature family of journals and other similar ‘high impact’ publishing outlets.  So why are we doing this and on what basis? In essence we are making a judgement on the likely impact of a paper’s findings. Editors attempt to answer two broad questions, how new are the insights presented here and how widely interesting are they likely to be. Papers that provide new conceptual insights of a sort that are likely to have wide implications and/or utility tend to be the papers a lot of people want to read. The sheer volume of scientific publication, and the wider explosion of readily accessible information, makes curation of breakthrough and important papers in a trusted and readily accessible place arguably more relevant today than ever. This is perhaps particularly true for findings which have an environmental planning or management implication and as such need to be seen and acted upon by a wide range of stakeholders. In this short talk I will outline how we select papers for impact, how that applies to synthesis papers and also outline how our thinking at Nature Climate Change is evolving to try to improve the way that we deal with synthesis papers through selection and review.