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What’s the point of this talk?

- When you write a review, you have two distinct audiences: the journal editor and the author of the paper.
- These audiences have different questions that you should answer in your review:
  - Editor: “Is this paper publishable?”
  - Author: “How can I improve this paper before it is published?”
- Both the editor and author want to see evidence that you read and understood the paper.
- By following the outline I’ll describe here, you’ll be helping your fellow scientists to publish more and better papers.
Who am I?

- Ph. D. from The Pennsylvania State University in the US
- First author or co-author of over 20 peer-reviewed papers
- Formerly a researcher, instructor, and scientific programmer
- Now oversee a team that coordinates peer reviews for hundreds of scientific manuscripts each month
What is the role of publishing in an academic career?

- Publishing high-quality papers as quickly as possible is still the primary goal of researchers in academic settings.
- The authors of the papers you review likely share this goal with you.
How does peer review fit into the publication process?

**AUTHOR**

- Performs research, writes the manuscript, and submits it
- Receives reviewer comments and makes necessary changes

**JOURNAL/EDITOR**

- Examines the manuscript
- Reads reviewer recommendations and relays comments to author
- Makes final decision (PUBLISH or REJECT?)

How does peer review fit into the publication process?

**AUTHOR**
- Performs research, writes the manuscript, and submits it.
- Receives reviewer comments and makes necessary changes.

**JOURNAL/EDITOR**
- Examines the manuscript.
- Reads reviewer recommendations and relays comments to author.
- Sends list of suggestions to the editor.

**REVIEWER**
- Evaluates whether the study is sound and appropriate for the journal.
- Makes final decision (PUBLISH or REJECT?)

How does peer review fit into the publication process?

**AUTHOR**
- Performs research, writes the manuscript, and submits it
- Receives reviewer comments and makes necessary changes

**JOURNAL/EDITOR**
- Examines the manuscript
- Reads reviewer recommendations and relays comments to author
- Makes final decision (PUBLISH or REJECT?)

**REVIEWER**
- Evaluates whether the study is sound and appropriate for the journal
- Sends list of suggestions to the editor

So:

- As a scientist, your goal is to publish high-quality papers as quickly as possible. The authors of the papers you review also have this goal.
- You can help the authors to publish better papers faster by providing specific, actionable review comments.
  - Better: Your review comments are used by the authors to improve their work.
  - Faster: If the editor can easily determine whether the authors have addressed your concerns, the paper can be published without additional rounds of review.
# What makes a bad peer review?

Bad peer reviews are usually short:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete review text</th>
<th>Why is this a bad review?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This paper is excellent, and it should be published in its current form.</td>
<td>While positive, this review provides no explanation of your assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The abstract is not properly formatted. Please rewrite it so that it includes introduction, methods, results, and conclusion sections.</td>
<td>This review comments only on formatting, a minor aspect of a scientific paper. The editor and author will wonder whether you understood the science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authors have used the wrong method to address their question. The paper should be rejected.</td>
<td>Provide more context to help the editor understand the paper’s flaws and a list of the paper’s shortcomings so the authors can improve their work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What makes a good peer review?

- A brief summary of the paper
- An explanation of how the paper adds to the literature
- An overall assessment of whether the paper should be published
- A description of any problems in the science that the paper describes
- A description of any problems in how the science is presented
- A detailed list of minor issues in the paper
Summary

• What question did the authors try to answer?
• What did the authors do to answer this question?
• What are the major conclusions of the paper?
Contribution to the literature

• Does the paper contribute something new to the literature, or are there already many other studies that reach the same conclusions?
• Have the authors acknowledged the work of other scientists through appropriate citations? If references to key papers are missing, provide explicit citations to them.
Publishability

• Your options include
  – “This paper is publishable without modification.”
  – “Minor revisions are required.”
  – “Major revisions are required.”
  – “The work described in this paper is not publishable.”
• Try to distinguish the science from how it’s presented -- could this work be published if the paper were revised?
• Consider omitting your opinion about whether the paper is appropriate for this journal; the editor will make that determination.
Quality of the science

- Is the question that the authors pose answerable?
- Are the methods appropriate?
- Have the methods been described in sufficient detail?
- Are the conclusions reasonable, given the data presented in the paper?
Presentation

- Is the paper appropriately structured?
- Is the language clear and easy to follow?
- Are the figures clear?
Minor issues

• Most papers have small issues, so this is your opportunity to help the authors to find and correct these problems.
• Use the page and/or line numbers in the manuscript to point out small issues in the paper.
• This list is more helpful to the authors than a scanned copy of the manuscript with handwritten comments (don’t send these).
• Don’t try to provide language editing in a review -- see https://www.aje.com/arc/peer-review-language-challenges/
So:

- A bad peer review leaves the editor and authors wondering whether you’ve read and understood the paper and/or doesn’t help the authors to improve their work.
- A good peer review establishes your credibility as a reviewer and provides both an assessment of whether the paper should be published and actionable suggestions that the authors can use to improve their work.
What’s the point of this talk?

• When you write a review, you have two distinct audiences: the journal editor and the author of the paper.
• These audiences have different questions that you should answer in your review:
  – Editor: “Is this paper publishable?”
  – Author: “How can I improve this paper before it is published?”
• Both the editor and author want to see evidence that you read and understood the paper.
• By following the outline I’ll describe here, you’ll be helping your fellow scientists to publish more and better papers.
How can I participate in peer reviewing?

• You’ll need to wait to be invited by a journal editor.
• Make sure you’re easily findable on the Internet! Create one of the following and include your publications, where you work, your title, and your e-mail address.
  – Google Scholar page
  – Researchgate.com
  – Institutional Web page
Thank you!
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