Peer Review

Tetsuro Majima

Institute of Scientific & Industrial Research Osaka University

Tetsuro Majima

- D. Eng., Osaka Univ. (1980)

- Research Associate, Dept. Chem., Univ. Texas at Dallas (1980-1982)
- Researcher, The Inst. Phys. & Chem. Res. (RIKEN) (1982-1994)
- Assoc. Prof., The Inst. Sci. & Ind. Res. (SANKEN), Osaka Univ. (1994-1997)
- Prof. (1997-present)

- Research focused on beam-induced molecular chemistry based on photo- and radiation-induced chemistry

Authored / Co-authored more than 500 articles

Contributions to International Journals

- 2007.1-2014.12, Senior Editor, *Langmuir*, ACS.
- 2008.10-2014.12, Editorial Advisory Board, *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*, ACS.
- 2011.9-present, Int. Editorial Board, *Rapid Communication in Photoscience*, Korean Society of Photoscience.
- 2011.9-2015.12, Editorial Board, *ChemPlusChem*, union of 16 European Chemical Societies, Wiley VHC.
- 2012.5-present, Associate Editor, *Photochemistry and Photobiology*, Wiley VHC.
- 2015.4, Editor of a special issue, *Rapid Communication in Photoscienece*, **2015**, *4*(1).

2016.1- Co-Chair, *ChemPlusChem*, union of 16 European Chemical Societies, Wiley VHC.

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)

Peer-Review in Practice (2)

- 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