

Peer Manuscript Reviews

Why Review at all?

Benefits to you in the short run

Doing a review confers an insider's view of the reviewing process.

The reactions of your peers all contain potential lessons to consider when you submit your own work.

Benefits to you in the long run = experience

Since good reviewers are hard to find, a track record of good reviews will enhance your reputation with editors, who may then give you visibility by placing you on editorial advisory boards.

Benefits to your school of thought

The refereeing process is political.

Anticipate attempts to sabotage quality work and thus try to be supportively critical.

Consider the following aspects when reviewing a manuscript:

Adopt a positive, impartial, but critical attitude toward the manuscript under review with the aim of promoting effective, accurate, and relevant communication.

Worthwhileness (e.g., significance to the scientific community)

Coherence (e.g., appropriateness of the approach or experimental design to the question)

Competence (e.g., appropriateness of the statistical analyses, appropriate literature citations, adequacy of techniques, and relevance of discussion)

Openness

Ethics

Credibility (e.g., soundness of conclusions and interpretations)

Adherence to Instructions to Authors

Other qualities of good research reports:

- adequacy of title and abstract
- appropriateness of figures and tables
- length
- organization
- originality

With increased citations of websites, access the given URL as part of your review.

Inaccessibility of a particular URL should be noted (including the date of attempt).

Commercial websites are not acceptable as references.

You are not required to correct deficiencies of style, syntax, or grammar, but any help you can give in clarifying meaning will be appreciated.

If it will assist the author, you may mark the text of the manuscript. However, use restraint. A manuscript that has been heavily marked is difficult to read.

It is imperative that the items you mark on the manuscript refer to points that you have made in the review (i.e., comments on the manuscript may not stand alone).