Peer Review: What it is, why it’s done and how to do it
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The Purpose of Peer Review

Peer review is a critical element of scholarly publication and one of the major cornerstones of the academic process:

- Acts as a filter, ensuring research is properly verified before being published
- Improves the quality of the research – rigorous review by other experts helps to refine key points and correct inadvertent errors
Introduction

• Review by peers has been a formal part of scientific communication since the first scientific journals appeared over 300 years ago

• The *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* is widely accredited as being the first journal to formalize the peer review process back in 1665
Introduction

• The reviewer is at the heart of scientific publishing and is “…… the lynchpin about which the whole business of Science is pivoted.”*

• It is a testament to the power of peer review that a scientific hypothesis or statement, presented to the world is largely ignored by the scholarly community unless it is first published in a peer-reviewed journal**


**Adrian Mulligan, Elsevier Research and Academic Relations Department
Introduction

• Reviewers, who are usually both authors and readers make the editorial process work by examining and commenting on manuscripts, often several times to improve them prior to publication

• Reviewers constitute the backbone of this process because both the quality and timelines of published papers depend directly on the thoroughness and promptness of the individual reviewer
Types of peer review

- **Single Blind Review**  
The names of the reviewers are hidden from the author.

- **Double Blind Review**  
Both the reviewer and the author remain anonymous.

- **Open Review**  
Reviewer and author are known to each other.
Introduction

Why do reviewers review?

• Academic ‘duty’
• General interest in the area
• Keep up-to-date with the latest developments
• Helps with their own research and/or stimulate new ideas
• Builds association with prestigious journals and editors
• Aware of new research before their peers
• Career development
Introduction

Questions reviewers should ask themselves before agreeing to review

- Does the article you are being asked to review match your expertise?
- Do you have time to review the paper?
- Are there any potential conflicts of interest?
Reviewing – the fundamentals
(or what a reviewer should be looking for)
Reviewing – the fundamentals

• In all submissions to the journal, authors must address the question of how their proposed methodology compares with previously reported methods.

• Authors must explain why the manuscript is of interest for the readers of the journal, and indicate the new information.

• Studies reported should be supported by a demonstration of the application of the method to actual samples.
Reviewing – the fundamentals

• Figures should only be used to improve the quality of the manuscript

• ‘All relevant references’ should be incorporated in the manuscript and be up-to-date

• “Personal Notes/Communications” and “Manuscripts Submitted” should not be incorporated in the “List of Reference”
Reviewing – the fundamentals

- The reviewers’ reports provide advice for editors to assist them in reaching a decision on a submitted paper.
- The final decision concerning a manuscript lies with the editor.
- Reviewing needs to be conducted confidentially, the article you have been asked to review should not be disclosed to a third party.
- The anonymity of the reviewer is strictly preserved.
Reviewing – the fundamentals

- Reviewers should **not communicate directly** with authors.
- All manuscripts and supplementary material are treated as **confidential** by the editors and only disclosed to the reviewer.
- The aim is to have a **response to the author within a specified time** after initial receipt of the manuscript.
- Meeting these **schedule objectives requires** extra effort on the part of the editorial staff, editor and reviewer.
- If reviewers treat others the way they would like to be treated as authors, working together we can achieve these objectives.
Reviewing – the fundamentals

Clear relation with Guide to Authors

- Reviewers need to review the manuscript with this in mind

Focus on Building Blocks of manuscript

- Abstract
- Introduction
- Experimental
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusion
- References, Tables, Figures
The Abstract

• Provides short description of perspective and purpose of the paper. Does not overemphasize perspective by providing a literature review

• Gives key results (recall that abstract is what is readily seen in electronic searching) but minimizes experimental details.

• Offers a short description of the interpretation/conclusion

• Brief--<250 words

• Accurately reflects the content of the article
Role of Reviewer:

• Prior to commenting on Abstract, if necessary, add a short (few sentence) summary of article, indicating a general comprehension of article, its importance, your enthusiasm.

• Avoid personal remarks and excessive or pointlessly clever and sarcastic remarks. Remember that reviewer comments can be hurtful. If you must “vent”, add such remarks to “comments to editor.”
The Introduction

• The introduction should be concise and to-the-point
• Provides proper perspective consistent with nature of journal
• Cites original and important work plus recent reviews for mature areas to provide context
• States purpose of paper and research strategy adopted to answer the question but does not give results and/or discussion or a summary of the paper (abstract should do this)
The Introduction

Role of Reviewer:

• To comment on effectiveness, clarity, organization
• To suggest changes in organization
• To document grammar, style problems
• To point authors to appropriate cites [Don’t only say “authors have done a poor job of citing relevant research.” At least point out that the “early work of Smith et al. has been (again) omitted”]
Experimental

- the author accurately explains how the data was collected
- the design is suitable for answering the question posed
- There is sufficient information to allow the research to be replicated
- the article accurately identifies the procedures followed, and these are ordered in a meaningful way
- If the methods are new, they are explained in detail
- the sampling is appropriate
- the equipment and materials have been adequately described
- the article makes it clear what type of data was recorded; and the author has been precise in describing measurements?

Role of Reviewer:
- see whether the above has been applied
Results and Discussion

- Include first a design of research. Continue with description of experimental results. Include “ongoing conclusions” if appropriate.
- Use figures to illustrate typical results, S/N, peak shapes. Minimize figures despite the cliché: “a figure is worth a thousand words. . .”
- Avoid excessively enthusiastic interpretations (Don’t use words such as “novel” “first time” “first ever” “paradigm-changing” etc. Allow others to draw such conclusions).
- Insure interpretations and interim conclusions are justified.
- Comment on suitability of data, tables, figures, etc for inclusion as supplementary material.
Results and Discussion (cont’d)

Role of Reviewer:

• **Suggest** organization changes, improvements in presentation and style
• Comment on logic and justification of conclusions and interpretations
• Detail concisely and carefully required changes (recall that author must respond or rebut your requirements!). Minimize the number, if possible. Avoid “thinking out loud
• Consolidate as one item suggested changes in style, grammar, and other small changes
• Comment on number of figures, tables, schemes, their need and their quality
• Require or suggest other experiments. Make clear the need for such. Defer to editor if you are unsure whether new experiments are essential or would be more appropriate for future studies
• When suggesting further work, be aware of the nature of submission—is it a communication, note, full article?
Conclusions

- Present global and specific conclusions
- Indicate uses and extensions if appropriate
- Suggest future experiments and indicate those that are underway
- Do not summarize paper (abstract is for that purpose)
- Avoid judgments about impact

Role of reviewer:

- Comment on validity and generality of conclusions. Request “toning down” claims to generality that are not justified
- Request removal of redundancies and summaries
References, Tables, Figures

Role of Reviewer:

- Check, if possible, accuracy of cites
- Comment on number of cites, if necessary
- Point out redundancies, incomplete cites (missing volume nos, page numbers, author spellings)
- Comment on need for figures, their quality, legibility (recall figs are often published in one column) presentation and relevance
- Comment on need for color in figures (recall color is allowed in electronic versions but expensive in print version)
- Comment on Table footnotes and request additional ones
Ethical Issues

- **Plagiarism.** If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible.

- **Fraud.** It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor.

- **Other ethical concerns.** If the research is medical in nature, has confidentiality been maintained? If there has been violation of accepted norms of ethical treatment of animal or human subjects these should also be identified.
Reviewing – the Mechanics

or

How – the basics of online reviewing
Introduction

Many Elsevier journals use the EES tool for managing the submission/review process. Other publishers will have similar platforms.

The following slides will outline the mechanics of completing an online review in EES.

- The process involves:
  - Invitation by e-mail
  - Accept/decline from within e-mail by invitee
  - Automatic login to relevant webpage
  - If invite accepted, completion of online review form
  - Thank you email upon completion of review
Dear Professor Zhou,

You are invited to review the above-mentioned manuscript that has been submitted for publication in Meat Science.

I know you have published in this area and so I would appreciate it if you could review this paper, or suggest an alternative.

The manuscript abstract is attached below. If you are willing to review this manuscript, please click on the link below:

******

If you are NOT able to review this manuscript, please click on the link below. We would appreciate receiving suggestions for alternative reviewers:

******

Alternatively, you may also register your response by accessing the Elsevier Editorial System for Meat Science as a REVIEWER using the logon credentials below:

http://ees.elsevier.com/meatsci/
Your username is: ******
If you need to retrieve password details, please go to:
http://ees.elsevier.com/meatsci/automail_query.asp

You may submit your comments online at the above URL. There you will find spaces for confidential comments to the editor, comments for the author and a report form to be completed.

To assist you in the reviewing process, I am delighted to offer you full access to Scopus® for 30 days. With Scopus you can search for related articles, references and papers by the same author. You may also use Scopus for your own purposes at any time during the 30-day period. If you already use Scopus at your institute, having this 30 day full access means that you will also be able to access Scopus from home. Access instructions will follow once you have accepted this invitation to review.

• The reviewer is invited by e-mail from the EES system of the journal

• The e-mail contains “Accept/Decline” links which the reviewer uses to indicate decision

• Depending on the manuscript type and /or journal, abstract is included in invitation e-mail
Reviewer Accepts Invitation

- After agreeing, the reviewer is automatically logged into the EES system.

- The manuscript you have agreed to review is in your pending assignments.
Making a decision

• The reviewer can download a PDF of the manuscript via “View Submission” link

• When ready, can then “Submit Recommendation”
Submitting the Review

• The reviewer will then follow through the review and make the decision

• The reviewer adds comments for the author

• Also adds comments for the Editor, if he/she wishes
Uploading Attachments as part of Review

- The reviewer, if he/she wishes, can upload Attachments as part of the review.

- Attachments can include, e.g. a sample figure file, which the reviewer feels might be of interest to the author, or an annotated PDF.
Submitting the Review

• The reviewer submits review, confirming it is correct before sending it to the Editor
Acknowledgement of Completed Review

- Upon completion of the review, the reviewer receives a “Thank You” e-mail confirming that the review has been received.
Informing of Editor decision

- Some journals inform the reviewer of the final decision made by the editor.

Dear Professor G-H Zhou,

Thank you once again for reviewing the above-referenced paper. With your help, the following final decision has now been reached:

Reject

The author decision letter and reviewer reports can be found below.

We appreciate your time and effort in reviewing this paper and greatly value your assistance as a reviewer for Meat Science.

If you have not yet activated or completed your 30 days of access to Scopus, you can still access Scopus via this link: http://scopees.elsevier.com/ees_login.asp?journalacronym=MEATSCI&username=GH Zhou. You can use your EES password to access Scopus via the URL above. You can save your 30 days access period, but access will expire 6 months after you accepted to review.
An Editor’s Advice to Reviewers

From Paul Haddad, Editor in Chief of the Journal of Chromatography A

1. **Be critical.** It is easier for an editor to overturn very critical comments than to overturn favorable comments.

2. **Justify all criticisms** by specific references to the text of the paper or to published literature. Vague criticisms are unhelpful.

3. **Don’t repeat information from the paper**, such as the title and authors names, since this already appears elsewhere in the review form.

4. **Check the Aims and Scope** of the journal to ensure that your comments are in accordance with journal policy.

5. **Give a clear recommendation.** Don't put "I will leave the decision to the editor" unless you are genuinely unsure of your recommendation.

6. **Number your comments** so that the authors can easily refer to them.

7. **Be specific** - refer to line numbers in the paper or to exact regions where you wish changes to occur.

8. **Be careful not to identify yourself** by your comments or by the file name of your report if you submit it as a Word file.
Resources for Reviewers

- Elsevier Reviewers Home
  [http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/reviewershome.reviewers](http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/reviewershome.reviewers)

- Sense About Science – an independent charitable trust