

UMass Chan Medical School

eScholarship@UMassChan

Library Publications

Lamar Soutter Library

2022-06-15

Interested in Peer Reviewing? Let's Talk

Regina Fisher Raboin

UMass Chan Medical School



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Follow this and additional works at: https://escholarship.umassmed.edu/lib_articles



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Raboin RF. (2022). Interested in Peer Reviewing? Let's Talk. Library Publications. <https://doi.org/10.13028/45ya-6038>. Retrieved from https://escholarship.umassmed.edu/lib_articles/235

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

This material is brought to you by eScholarship@UMassChan. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Publications by an authorized administrator of eScholarship@UMassChan. For more information, please contact Lisa.Palmer@umassmed.edu.

Interested in Peer Reviewing? Let's Talk

Regina Fisher Raboin
Editor-in-chief

Journal of eScience Librarianship (JeSLIB)
escholarship.umassmed.edu/jeslib/ | @JeSLIBJournal

-

Associate Director
Lamar Soutter Library, UMass Chan Medical School
regina.raboin@umassmed.edu
Twitter: @RegRab77

June 15, 2022

Peer Review and Scholarly Publishing

Traditional

- Review/evaluation/refereeing of peers scholarly work in the same or related academic fields/profession
- Why?
 - Quality
 - Credibility/Validation
 - Improvements to writing, flow, comprehension, and objectives (aims)
 - Suitability for publication
- How?
 - Anonymous/Blind: reviewers and authors
 - Anonymization is authors responsibility
 - Guided

Peer Review and Scholarly Publishing

Open

- Types
 - Transparent: authors and reviewers known
 - Collaborative/Open participation: invited and/or broader community; peer review documents are open
 - Post-publication: manuscript is open for review pre- and post-publication
- Why?
 - Constructive
 - Reduce conflicts-of-interest
 - Transparency
 - Collaborative
 - Quality
 - Inclusive

Publishing Process

Roles	Responsibilities
Editor-in-chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determines journal's overall direction, strategy; seeks new partnerships• Writes issue editorials• Coordinates editorial team• Identifies new peer reviewers• Liaison to Editorial Board• Recruits new submissions• Reviews new submissions for aims & scopes• Submits articles to plagiarism software
Associate Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Editor and coordinator for special issues• Liaison to Editorial Board• Identifies new peer reviewers• Recruits new submissions
Managing Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Primary liaison to authors post submission for publishing• Coordinates formatting and copy-editing process• Publishes articles• Promotes journal using social media
Distribution Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Liaison to software vendor• System troubleshooting• Maintains website• Registers DOIs and manages Crossref account• Reviews final versions of articles• Publishes articles

Publishing Process

Roles	Responsibilities
Copy Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Copy editing of accepted manuscripts
Peer Reviewers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Review submitted manuscripts following journal's guidelines● Recommend whether to accept or reject submissions● Suggest new reviewers
Editorial Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Advise editorial team● Assist with special projects● Promote journal to new communities● Promote open access initiatives● Recruit new submissions● Serve as peer reviewers

Peer Reviewing: *JeSLIB* Process

The Editor-in-Chief verifies that all necessary materials have been submitted and begins the peer review process.

- *JeSLIB* is configured for two reviewers per article with 21 days for review. These options as well as the default message to reviewers can be revised for a specific manuscript.
- *JeSLIB* utilizes an anonymous peer review process, which means that the identities of the authors are concealed from the reviewers, and vice versa, throughout the review process.
- The Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor assigns reviewers to the manuscript and provides reviewer guidelines document; reviewers either agree to review the article or decline.
- Those who agree to review receive an email with further instructions.
- Reminders are sent periodically to reviewers. Due date can be revised later if necessary for a reviewer.
- Reviewers upload reviews by following instructions and clicking on the link in the email they received. They recommend whether to **Accept with Minor Revisions**, **Major Revisions Needed before Acceptance**, or **Reject** the submission. Upon completion, reviewers receive a thank you email from the system and the editors receive notification that a review has been uploaded.
- Editor will make the decision if the reviewers have different recommendations; Editor reserves the right to assess reviews for fairness, constructive comments.

Peer Reviewing: JeSLIB Guidelines

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pYW4eYIYMOXw4P01LysowXacgE7kpw9QsxFltkOtTdk/edit?usp=sharing>

Best Practices (adapted from: *Best Practices for Peer Reviewing: The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, see link in Resources slide)

Remember: every journal embraces similar methods for reviewing, but it is good to understand the nuances a journal may have before beginning the review

- Confirm that the manuscript you have is the one you were asked, and agreed, to review.
- Read the manuscript straight-through **before** starting the review.
- Write a **brief draft** of your review (before submitting).
 - Overview of the manuscript: What is it about? Is it original? Does it contribute to the cannon or research or application in this area?
Include some quick thoughts about the overall ideas/structure.
- Use concise and clear writing.
- **Be positive and constructive:** think - “If I were this author what would I want to read in a review.”
 - Provide details about the issues in the manuscript and suggestions for how to fix these.
- Be polite and respectful: grace and constructive criticism are combinable and useful. You are knowledgeable in the area you are reviewing, and so is the author, so think of this as a dialog between two experts.
- Use the ‘Notes or Comments’ to the editor if you need to comment strongly about a manuscript.
- **Help the author understand the strengths and the weaknesses of their manuscript.**
- Comment on poor citation practices, grammar, spelling, etc., but do not take the time to copy edit - this is usually covered by the journal.
- In deciding on the type of acceptance - the journal you are reviewing for will give guidance.
- When in doubt about what to write, category of acceptance, reservations about the manuscript, etc., **work with the editor** to help overcome hurdles or problems or get direction.

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA)

- Reduce editor and reviewer bias
 - Triple peer review process
 - Open peer review
- Recruit diverse reviewers
- Use platforms that support innovation and accessibility
- Special issues focusing on DEIA within a field

Resources

General

- COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics
<https://publicationethics.org/>

Also see COPE: Peer Review Process <https://publicationethics.org/guidance?classification=2779>

- Folk, Amanda L. Editor-in-chief. (October 2021). Best Practices for Peer Reviewing: Journal of Academic Librarianship. <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/the-journal-of-academic-librarianship/news/best-practices-for-peer-reviewing-the-journal-of-academic-librarianship>
- Librarian Peer Reviewer Database. (2021). <https://sites.google.com/view/mlprdatabase/home>.
- Library Publishing Coalition: Resources (broad content about all areas of library publishing)
<https://librarypublishing.org/resources/>
- McKarney, Lesley. (April 20, 2001). Peer-Review Techniques for Novices. *Science*.
<https://www.science.org/content/article/peer-review-techniques-novices>
- Society for Scholarly Publishing - The Scholarly Kitchen Archives: Peer Review
<https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/collection/peer-review/>

Writing

- The Plain Language Action and Information Network (PLAIN). <http://Plainlanguage.gov>
- Hemingway Editor. <https://hemingwayapp.com/>

Resources (cont.)

Open Peer Review

- F1000 (Faculty of 1000) <https://f1000.com/blog/peer-review-establishing-quality/>
- Ford, Emily. (November 2016). *Keeping Up with...Open Peer Review*. Association of College & Research Libraries, American Library Association. https://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/keeping_up_with/opr
- Public Library of Science (PLOS) <https://plos.org/resource/open-peer-review/>
- Morton, Lindsey. (June 14, 2022). *Published Peer Review History at PLOS: Observations from the past three years*. The Official PLOS Blog. Public Library of Science (PLOS).
<https://theplosblog.plos.org/2022/06/observations-on-published-peer-review-history/>

Ethics, including DEIA

- Library Publishing Coalition Ethical Framework Task Force. (2018) *An Ethical Framework for Library Publishing, Version 1.0*. Atlanta, GA: Educopia. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316777>.

Self-paced Training

- Ford, Emily. (April 11, 2022). “[Peer Review: A Critical Primer and Practical Course](https://www.oercommons.org/courses/peer-review-a-critical-primer-and-practical-course/view)”. The Scholarly Communications Notebook.
<https://www.oercommons.org/courses/peer-review-a-critical-primer-and-practical-course/view>