Reviewing

Why Review

- As a service to your field
  - Acceptable ratio/workload
- To help steer the direction of your field
- To keep up with the recent literature
- **Not** to help a friend/colleague publish

Conducting Reviews

- Before Accepting Review
  - Do you have expertise in this area?
  - Do you have conflicts of interest?
    - Examples?
  - Can you complete the review by the deadline?

Conducting Reviews

- Writing the Review
  - Begin with brief summary of overall message of the article
  - Mention strengths
  - Then delve into any suggested changes
    - Uncorrectable weaknesses
    - Correctable weaknesses
    - Minor corrections - grammar etc.
  - Render decision with justification
    - Revise (major, minor), Reject, Accept

Conducting Reviews

▸ Focus on flaws in methodology - improper or inadequate use of control conditions, improper counterbalancing, failure to randomize, biased selection, limited validity, poor operationalization of constructs, poor reporting of details, improper statistical analysis, ethics, small sample size, etc.

Conducting Reviews

▸ Was the data and rationale for the study presented clearly?
▸ Were the results easy to follow?
▸ Were all the figures and tables necessary and easy to read?
▸ Would there have been a better way to present the data?

Conducting Reviews

▸ Also indicate problems with the authors' presentation and interpretation of results.
▸ Did they fully consider alternative accounts? Was their point of view balanced?
▸ Did they consider other theoretical positions in the introduction to the topic?
▸ Did they extrapolate beyond their data?

Conducting Reviews

▸ Does the data make an important, modest or detrimental contribution to the literature?
  ▸ Original?

▸ Are further experiments needed before the paper should be accepted? If so, what would these experiments be?

Conducting Reviews

- Is the article a good fit for this particular journal?
  - Topic
  - Readership
  - Impact
  - Rejection rate

  - Weighting of novelty versus rigor

Conducting Reviews

- Be tentative where appropriate
- You do not need to comment on everything
- Grammatical issues?

Conducting Reviews

- Tone
  - Be constructive - goal should be to help author turn MS into a significant contribution
  - Do not be condescending or overly critical
  - Mention positives as well as negatives
  - If there is nothing blatantly wrong, do not look for minor flaws to prove your own worth

Etiquette

- Be on time!
- Do not discuss content of the MS under review
  - Do not share!
  - Ask permission to have a co-reviewer
- Do not steal ideas
- Do not force authors to cite your own work

Special Cases

- Commentaries
- Pre-Registration
- Replications

- Published Review Process?
- Anonymity?

Different Models

- Scholar One
- PeerJ/PLOS One
- Frontiers
- Personality Assessment