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Peer Review

—What It Is, How It Works, and Why It Matters!
Why is it important?
The peer-review system protects the community from ill-founded reports.

J. C. Polanyi, Nobel laureate (Globe&Mail, Oct. 3, 2011) said,

• Such censorship is hazardous, hence subject to constant scrutiny by the scientific community.
• The objective is
  a) to flag what’s important
  b) to set aside what’s pedestrian, and
  c) to abjure what’s fraudulent.
• That’s a tall order, but the health of science depends on it.
What is the role of peer-review in scholarship?

✓ Ensure scientific integrity
✓ Ensure relevance
✓ Ensure the quality of the transmission of scientific information
✓ It’s meant to make your work BETTER!
Peer-Review in Practice (1)

- The Editor-in-Chief receives a manuscript, examines it, and then:
  1) Transmits it to an Associate Editor who has the proper expertise — OR —
  2) Decides to decline or publish

✓ Inappropriate topic for the journal’s readers
✓ Poor quality (written in poor English, incorrect formatting)
✓ Blatant lack of novelty (in view of previous articles)
The Associate Editor may:

1) Evaluate on a similar basis — OR —
2) Transmit the manuscript to Reviewers for further evaluation

Editors evaluate the Reviewer comments and decide to accept the manuscript, return it for revision, or decline to publish.
How might an Editor come to a decision?

• Read each Reviewer report carefully, and examine the manuscript.
• Assess the concerns of the Reviewers.
• If questions still remain, the Editor may request the comments of another scientist.
• Transmit the decision to the Authors, often with an explanation, especially in cases of rejection or request for major revisions.
How should Authors handle Reviewer comments?

• Reviewers are trying to help!
  ✓ Their feedback is important and invaluable.
• Authors must read the Reviewers’ comments
  ✓ Carefully
  ✓ Understand the nature of the critique
  ✓ Evaluate their importance
  ✓ Revise according to the critique

If an Author chooses not to address some of the critique, the Author must indicate why he/she is taking that course of action.
What are the most-common mistakes Authors make when replying to Editors and Reviewers?

• Lack of attentiveness

✓ Authors need to thoroughly examine the critique in each review.

• Incomplete revisions

✓ Failure to explain why some changes were not made. Each comment by a Reviewer should be examined and addressed point by point whether or not the Author actually makes the requested change.

• Becoming EMOTIONAL

✓ Reviews are not personal—do not take them as such.
Editor’s (associate editor’s) work

Supporting Information

Reproducibility