

## Are You Too Inexperienced to Review? No!

- Start reviewing early in your career.
- “I wouldn’t have asked you if I didn’t think you could do it.”
- Practice for your own research papers.
- Your opinion won't be the only one.
- You get to see the paper before publication.
- Ideas for your own research?
- Accelerate your learning.
- Increases your exposure.
- Early-career scientists often provide the most thorough and helpful reviews.

## Rules for Reviewers

- *Review at least 2–3 times the number of papers you submit to journals each year.*
- *Reviewers should review the manuscript in front of them, not the one they wished they were reading.*
- *Adequately explain and support your review. Provide citations where relevant.*
- *Identify failures of the authors to cite relevant research.*
- *Identify your strengths and weaknesses as a reviewer to the Editor.*
- *Tell the Editor about any ethical issues with the manuscript: plagiarism, duplicate publication, conflict of interest, etc.*

## Ethics of Reviewers #1

Do not review a manuscript (or return it, if already accepted) when:

- No time to perform the review
- No experience (or disclose this inexperience to editor)
- Circumstances exist that prevent you from providing an unbiased review
  - Conflict of interest (financial, supervisory, etc.)
  - Your own research is too similar
  - You have a personal or professional connection with one of the authors

## Ethics of Reviewers #2

Treat the manuscript as a confidential document

- Do not show/discuss with others
- Specific questions to others are OK
- Disclose that information to Editor
- Obtain consent of author to disclose unpublished information

## Ethics of Reviewers #3

*Respect the intellectual independence of the authors.*

## Ethics of Reviewers #4

*Never resort to personal attacks.*

## How to Write a Review

- Print out the paper single sided

- Read the paper once for “pleasure”
  - Don’t take notes
  - Make minimal notes
- Read the paper a second time, writing the review as you go along
- Possible third read of paper to confirm impressions
- Proofread review for inflammatory language

### **Structure of a Review**

1. Summary of manuscript and its significance to the science and the journal
2. Your recommendation
3. Fatal flaws (especially if recommending rejection)
4. Major comments
5. Minor comments
6. Typos and misspellings

### **When Making Major Criticisms...**

- State why change needs to be made
- Appeal to readers/audience, rather than your impression
- Provide evidence for why change needs to be made
- Suggest possible experiments or additional calculations
- Offer suggested revision
- Indicate why change would benefit paper

### **Responding to Reviewers**

- Address or refute each reviewer’s concerns. Clearly state changes, provide quotations, and make reference to specific areas of text.
- If you choose to not make the requested change, respond in as detailed a manner as possible.
- If you made major revisions or are resubmitting a rejected manuscript, summarize your major changes first (in cover letter or responses).
- Consider compromising, even if you don’t need to. This may avoid having the readers ask the same questions as the reviewers did.