

Scholarly Peer Reviewer Training

Thank you everyone for being here.

I might be a little discombobulated here at the beginning as I'm continuing to let people in.

Um, but I wanted to go ahead and get started with the presentation, um, because the fun part well is at the end where we have our panel and we talk about as a collective, um, those of us that have had experiences doing scholarly peer review, um, answer some questions and kind of have a dialogue.

So I really want this to be much more of a conversation and kind of a presentation of sorts, but I do have some material prepared to, to provide a context.

Uh, so welcome to the Scholarly Peer Review training.

So I am Stella Smith.

I'm an associate research, um, chair for C and I am pleased to be joined by several, uh, fellows in the center, Dr. Karen Johnson, Dr.

Jim Rice, and Dr. Louis under, who are going to be part of the panel at the end, uh, along with the rest of you as we'll have this conversation towards the end of our presentation.

So this is the agenda, uh, discussing the importance of scholarly peer review, some characteristics of helpful reviews, uh, what you think versus what you say.

So those, some interesting things.

Um, talk a little bit about the expectations as a Phoenix Scholar peer reviewer.

So several, uh, the, the genesis of this session was to provide some training for those individuals that have volunteered to be Phoenix Scholar peer reviewers.

And so we wanna include that sec that session in here, and we'll talk more about that in detail, um, as those reviewers are doing that work.

And then getting into the, uh, the panel review.

So first, the importance of scholarly peer review.

So, scholarly peer review is critical, um, because it is the, in some ways the currency of academia.

Um, you submit your work, um, to be part of the scholarly literature, your colleagues review that work and provide feedback about how that work has made contribution to the field, its quality, um, the way in which it extends the field, the way in which you have done, uh, appropriate, valid, trustworthy research in order to move a topic forward.

And so the primary aim of peer review is to ensure integrity and credibility in our academic research and the process.

Uh, an overview of the process is, you know, authors work on manuscripts for however many months and submit them to some

kind of journal article, uh, journal for possible publication.

And generally there is an editorial assessment before it's sent out to peer reviewers to ensure that that work is connected to, or, uh, connected to the purpose of the journal, which you sent it to.

Um, make sure that it is something that the journal is wanting to, um, send out is within theme for what they're doing, uh, and also looking at the quality of the work, the writing and whatnot.

And it's, uh, a very, um, cursory review of your document for that.

Uh, if you don't meet that criteria, then you'll normally get what's sometimes called a desk reject, where they will send you a letter back to say, this manuscript doesn't meet whatever criteria for our journal.

Uh, you might consider doing some revisions and sending it to another, uh, another journal.

Um, then if you met, if you pass the initial editorial assessment, you will have an expert evaluation.

And that is, uh, where the reviewers that have an expertise in your topic will review it.

Generally, it's at least two reviewers that do this peer review.

And those peer reviewers will write feedback related to what you've put together, what your manuscript is, how they feel the quality of that manuscript is, and they'll provide an assessment as to whether request, Hey, mark, mark, mark.

Can you mute your phone? I'm trying to figure that that out.

Hold on. I think I was able to mute.

I think I was able to mute it. Okay. Oh, thank you, mark.

Um, so then those editors, uh, the reviewers will provide recommendations for whether to accept, reject, or request revisions for your manuscript.

And, um, then the editor will read the reviewer's feedback and then make the final decision as to whether the, the article is accepted, rejected, or, um, request those revisions.

And so peer review is part of our academic community, um, and it is a way that we as colleagues, uh, support each other, I feel, to move our fields forward and advance the knowledge within our disciplines.

Can I ask a question, Stella? Sure. Um, did, would the, um, peer reviewers typically divide up the task into, you know, one will address academic standards, another will address, I don't know, significance or methodology, something like that? No. In my experience, a peer reviewer, each peer reviewer does, it, does their own complete review.

Okay. So then the editor has two complete views of what, um, or an assessment of what has been presented to them.

Got it. Thanks. Uh, and then they can make a decision.

So, and that, and that leads to a really great point, like, what if reviewer one and reviewer two don't agree, right? One thinks that this is the best thing, uh, in the world, one thinks it needs all sorts of

revisions, then either they go to a reviewer three, which often happens, or the editor goes in and reads it as a reviewer three to make an assessment of whether of what the ranking will be, whether it's a, um, rejection or an accept or, um, revise and resubmit.

Thanks. You're welcome.

And so why participate in peer review? So, one, it's amazing professional development.

I know the experiences that I've had peer reviewing have helped me know what is at the front of the field, like how my field is moving, um, and I can assess how my work is in conversation with the work that's supposedly the cutting edge of the work that's being submitted to journals.

Um, it's also a contribution to the academic com community.

So I feel like it's part of my responsibility to be in conversation with the literature as an academic.

And so, um, to be able to provide that review for my colleagues and also hopefully have them provide that review for me is very important.

Uh, it helps you build your reputation, excuse me, your reputation in networking.

So you do get credit for your cv, um, if you are doing reviews and you're getting those reviews, um, I guess, um, reported through different, um, reporting agencies.

So, um, I just did one and they were putting it through these different, um, uh, organizations that, that kind of bank the number of reviews that you do or, or note the number of reviews that you do.

So making sure that you share your orchid number with them if you have an orchid number so that, that you can show what your, uh, contribution to the field is, either with your journal articles or with your review activity, uh, or if you're on editorial boards as well.

Uh, it helps you improve your writing skills.

So I learned so much from reading other authors' work, uh, and it is really helpful for me as I begin to write and I begin to think about my phrasing, how are these things, uh, written in the journals? Because there's a, there's a way in which there's a cadence in which you write journal articles.

It's different than when you write a dissertation.

It's different than when you do a blog.

Um, it's different when than when you just write a general paper.

And so understanding that is, is helpful and it increases your opportunity to, um, have, have skills that help you get published in the future.

Uh, and then also for career advancement, being part of the academic community, having your name out there really makes, can make a difference.

Dr. Smith, you might wanna mention what an orchid ID is.

So an orchid ID is, um, almo, it's like your electronic footprint.

So anytime you do, uh, write something, anytime you, um, do any reviews, anytime you, um, are on editorial boards, you can, you can share your orchid number and it gathers all that information together.

And so you can give that number to folks and they can go in there and see a full portfolio for your work in the field.

And when we transition to the panel, I can show you, um, the orchid.

I think I might be able to pull up my own orchid so you can see what, uh, what that is.

But you sign up for it, it's free.

And then every time you have some kind of scholarly activity, whether it's when you write a journal article or when you do a review, you connect that, um, that activity to your orchid number and it is an electronic, um, another electronic, uh, footprint for what you're doing.

Um, so I, I'll show a little bit more about that.

Um, for those that might not have, uh, or might not be familiar with it, thank you for asking me to clarify.

So what are some characteristics of helpful reviews? So helpful reviews, discuss the strengths and weaknesses in our constructive and respectful and address big picture.

Um, so I always think about the sandwich method, and most of you all are faculty, so you understand how to give feedback, right? How to give constructive feedback.

Uh, so it doesn't focus on just the weaknesses and it's not a harsh or demeaning tone, but it really focuses on big picture.

How does this work that has been presented to me, uh, impact the field, extend the field, and how have these authors or these colleagues written this in a way that shows its impact? They helpful reviews, evaluate the theoretical framework.

Um, but sometimes it's not as helpful to say that specific citations are missing, um, particularly when those, uh, articles are by the reviewer.

So, and I've seen this where because our, uh, journals want to select authors that are in the same topic area as the person that's writing.

You know, sometimes when, uh, reviewers read, they assume that their work should also be included in the work of, uh, this potential, uh, this potential offer.

And so really evaluating, okay, the work related to this particular project, the work related to what is being presented to me in this manuscript does the theoretical framework or do the articles that are presented to support that really support that argument regardless of whether your work is included in that or not.

So you evaluate the quality of the methodology.

So not whether, um, you would've chosen that particular methodology, but is the methodology actually appropriate for the work that's being done? Um, and so here it says, not helpful.

Reviews are ask if this, uh, is exactly the way I would conduct the research.

So that is not the focus.

The focus is to see if the methodology is appropriate for what the author has, uh, presented.

And I think for most of you, you're looking at dissertation students.

You're looking at, um, work that students have done.

You know how to evaluate a methodology without including yourself in that methodology.

So evaluating quality of analysis, that's important for helpful reviews.

Also, the quality of the discussion.

How does the discussion really emphasize how this work is important? And it extends the field.

Um, so not helpful, refuse really skim over the analysis.

Um, they comment on analysis when the reviewer does not have the proper expertise to really comment on the analysis.

And they make broad critiques without providing guidance.

And so sometimes you'll get a whole, an offer to review.

And when they do that, they ask you if the article is actually within your area of expertise.

Some people will just say yes just because they want to review.

Um, but it is really very important that you have an expertise in the topic in what you're doing, a review, because that is, um, one of the ways that your reviewing was really gonna be helpful for your participant, your authors, because you actually have that expertise.

So if you don't have that expertise, it is more helpful to not do the review, to allow someone with the expertise to help that author, the person who submitted the manuscript, really get the kind of feedback that they need to make sure their work provides a contribution.

So helpful reviews address the clarity, the organization and the readability of the submission.

Um, they identify things that would be helpful to enhance it.

And they're also specific enough to help authors, uh, improve.

So not having specific, um, constructive feedback is that helpful for those authors, uh, in order to improve the manuscript.

So that's really a key part of, um, doing a review and also the time that it takes to actually do a sufficient review.

Um, so it's not as much about typos or writing errors, even though the writing is just, uh, a challenge.

If you can't get to the, um, if you can't get to the ideas of the work because the typos and the writing area errors are preventing you from doing that, uh, hopefully that manuscript would've got desk rejected before it came to you.

But mentioning that is definitely important.

But if there are a couple of errors, you know, saying that they're there, but not lingering on those, but really focusing in on the substance of what is in the article, and again, specificity is key.

So helpful articles also also clearly explain the reviewer's evaluation without specifying a recommendation.

So this is very important.

The review is gonna go to your, uh, the manuscript author.

You don't wanna put anything in your review that hints to the author whether you think it should be, uh, revised and resubmit, whether it should be accepted or whether it should be rejected.

That is the job of the editor to share that information or to be the one to share that information.

The review is really about looking at the article itself and providing feedback about that article without giving a recommendation.

And usually there's a confidential comments area where you could talk to the editor, um, one-on-one and talk about any challenges that might be within the manuscript.

Um, and also there do, um, good reviews, helpful reviews are submitted on time.

Uh, so linked uh, reviews sometimes aren't as helpful.

Um, those of you that are publishing, probably pretty much all of us know that the peer review process takes a long time anyway.

And then adding on top of that being, um, being late with your reviews, um, can be a challenge for both editors.

And it's a challenge for your colleagues that have submitted a manuscript.

Are there any questions? I see some things happening in the chat, but I don't know what they are 'cause I can't see the chat.

So if there's a, is there a question there? Could somebody share? Share? Nothing. Okay.

Uh, Stella? I just, yes, I just put some comments in there.

I didn't have any questions.

One of 'em was a web of science is the same idea as orchid.

Oh, okay. Thank you. And Researchers, uh, researchers, something or other, there's three databases that, uh, will collect your information as your peer review, or if you write and they kind of talk to each other, um, yeah, you can link them. You can link them. Yeah. You have to ask permission though.

'cause some of them will, like with orchid, they will say no, the, the person that you're trying to link with, that, that database will say yes or no.

Most of them, uh, journals will automatically just accept you.

Web of science is the same way. And, um, researchers is too.

And the other thing I said was just that you, you had mentioned sandwich and I used Oreo Good. Oh, Okay. Bad. Good.

Yeah.

So that they leave when they leave, and, you know, when they leave, if it's a person to person or if they're reading it, they feel good about it, even though you give them some constructive cons.

Criticism. Mm-hmm. You didn't, you didn't tear 'em up.

You just, you make them feel good when they, when they read it.

So that's all, if that's there.

Thank you. Thank you so much. Welcome.

So I have a couple of these, what you think versus what you say, and I see the time.

Um, so we might go through maybe three of these.

The PowerPoint and the recording will be on the research methodology routine.

So if you wanna go through some of the others, we can, uh, you, you will be able to, but I wanna make sure that I leave enough time for the panel and the open discussion part.

So we'll see how we go through this.

And then maybe five more minutes, and then we'll transition.

And I, I've done this training for junior, like, like, uh, graduate students.

And so, so they had some interesting reactions to some of this.

So, um, as you're reading the article or the manuscript, if what you think is, the authors appear to have no idea what they're talking about, and I don't think they have read any of the literature on this topic, which has sometimes happened.

Um, what you might say is the study fails to address how the findings relate to the previous research in this area.

The author should consider revising their introduction in discussion to reference the related recent literature, especially recently published work, such as, and this gives examples of literature, but it's not specifically them trying to give examples of their old, the, the, the reviewer trying to give examples of their own work.

It's like kind of trying to push the authors into a space where they're in conversation with the recent literature in the field.

Another example is the writing is so bad, it's practically unreadable.

I can barely bring myself to finish it.

Uh, which you would say is while the study appears to be sound or what you could say, while, while the study appears to be sound, the language is unclear, making it difficult to follow, authors should consider revising the manuscript to improve the flow and readability of the text.

So really trying to come from, um, a constructive and supportive way, but still giving them the feedback that there needs to be some revision within the script.

So here's another one. It's obvious that this type of experiment should have been included.

I have no idea why the authors didn't use it.

This is a big mistake.

Uh, something that you might be able, that's what you think.

What you might say is the authors are off to a good start.

However, the study would be improved with additional experiments, particularly X.

Alternatively, the authors might consider including more information that clarifies and justifies their choice of methods.

So if they believe that what they've done is sufficient, then provide more clarification and justification for that choice.

I have a couple more of these, but any thoughts about the three that we've shared so far? And Dr. Smith, all these are, all these are fantastic.

Another one that I run across quite a bit is dated references.

Mm-hmm. Um, so I'll often recommend specific current references that they might consider integrating into their work.

Um, yeah. To, to raise the impact of the, uh, and relevance of the writing, so Exactly. And make sure it's in, in conversation with the current state.

Because often I talk to students, the ones that I'm working with on dissertation, they will talk about a topic and they'll leave a huge event out that completely shifts it.

Like an example is like covid. Mm-hmm.

I was talking to a student, she was talking about, uh, restorative justice practices for middle school students and using the time which we, in which we were in Covid as a timeframe in which she was gonna conduct a study.

Uh, and it was like, you can't, you can't avoid something that's so big like that, that just changes the game.

So you have to be in conversation with current literature to make sure that all this effort that you're putting into this work and this research actually extends the field.

Yeah. Another one that's really common that I run across is, um, authors that will in, in great deal describe the academic framework they're using the theoretical or conceptual framework, and then not use it at all in the analysis.

And then, yeah, I'm often replying something to the fact that you might consider, you know, elevating these theories that you used in your analysis more explicitly.

Right. Fantastic. Fantastic.

That's definitely a, I think a spot that we could do as, as senior scholars as well, you know, that we can forget that we need to make sure that we emphasize the, the words.

So I'll do one more of these and then we'll move past this.

So this is horrible, confusing, and impossible to read.

And so how would we say that the author should clarify blank to assist the reader with understanding the research study in the final? Uh, so that's another example.

I think I have a couple of more in here, Liz, like I said, you can look at, um, at your leisure, um, later on.

But I would like to get to here this expectation so we can get to the panel where we can take this screen share off and really have a conversation.

So for those of you that are considering, um, being, uh, Phoenix Scholar, peer reviewers, uh, this is the website, the call for submissions, everybody is open to please submit for this.

Um, the deadline is August 8th, and, uh, this is the link for it here.

And when we come off the screen share, I might be able to go to it on my computer.

But the expectations for peer reviewers, uh, we expect that you'll review no more than three manuscripts, but this might, uh, change depending on how many we receive.

Um, as we talked about, normally each, uh, article has two peer reviewers.

So we will do that. We will model that process, uh, provide an assessment of each article based on the review criteria.

And I'm gonna show that to you in just a moment.

Uh, provide constructive feedback to the authors, similar to what we described, uh, in the earlier part of the session.

And then submit the articles with feedback, uh, by the dean.

So the evaluation criteria will be significant validity, quality, originality, and ethical considerations.

And I can provide more information on those in just a moment.

And you will be recommending whether it's, uh, the article should be published, whether it's a revision and a resubmission, or if you feel like it's a rejection, providing that recommendation.

And then that will go. So that's the first step.

And then it'll come to the editorial, uh, board to make a final decision as to which one of those steps, um, will, which one of those outcomes will be for that article.

So being, um, sometimes people feel bad about rejecting an article, and so if you give it the proper review and it actually needs to be rejected in order to make sure that that article is gonna really present and represent that scholar well then rejection is a gift, right? So help that, help that scholar make sure that the work that they are doing reflects them in the best life because it will follow them.

Uh, and so giving a proper assessment is important.

So here's an example.

You'll have a ranking from excellent to poor.

There's a description of what the points are for each one for significance, validity, quality, um, for originality and ethical considerations.

And then you'll have an opportunity, again, as I mentioned, to do the overall assessment and then provide a comment at the end.

And you'll have access to this.

So I just wanted to just show you, uh, what, what it will be.

It'll be this exact rubric that we will send to you.

So now I wanna transition into our panel discussion in the questions.

And let me just show this last slide real quick.

If you are not part of the research methodology, group teams, if you have your phone, you can scan this or you can, uh, use this link to join, or you can email me and I will add you.

But we would love for you to be part of the research methodology, group team's, community, um, so that we can continue to be in a conversation with you.

So I am going to stop my share stop recording.

Stop sharing.

Oh, there. How funny. Okay.

Alright, so now I want to be in conversation with my colleagues about peer review.

Uh, are there any questions before we transition into this part of our presentation? Okay. So this first question, so our colleagues are Dr. Karen Johnson, Dr.

Jim Rice, and Dr. Lee Unal.

Those, uh, individuals will be sharing the, uh, responses to these questions.

So the first question is, what criteria do you consider most important when evaluating the quality and impact of a journal article? And how do you ensure these criteria are met in your review? And the, uh, primary respondent for this one is Dr. Jobs.

Thank you, Dr. Smith.

As I was looking, um, at some of the rubrics that I use when I'm doing, uh, reviews for articles for different journals, I found like six, uh, major criteria that are pretty common across the board, and they're ones that I always use.

I'm gonna mention those, but I'm only gonna talk about two of them in the interest of time.

But the areas are originality and innovation, relevance and significance, methodological rigor, clarity and coherence, contribution to existing literature, and of course, ethical considerations.

But two, I wanna talk about just briefly are the clarity and coherence.

Often when we're reading a manuscript that's been submitted for possible publication in a journal, I find it necessary to read and reread the article several times to make sure that I'm understanding not only what the author is saying, but also trying to understand their intent.

Because I think that's important when we're providing feedback, I check whether the manuscript is well organized, is it clearly written? Because clear communication isn't, is like vital for the research to be understood by the reader.

So we really need to spend a lot of time making sure that, as you mentioned in one of your samples while I ago, that the writing is clear and coherent.

And I, especially because I'm a university research methodologist, spend quite a bit of time looking at the methodological rigor of the study.

And, um, I know not everybody does that, but I start with making sure that the research method, quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods is included in the keywords and in the title.

Um, the research design should also be included in both those places.

But then every aspect of the article should align with the research design that the author has said they have used.

And sometimes, um, it's, it's difficult to figure out if some steps were skipped along the way.

Maybe they didn't quite align, so they decided not to talk about them, or they left things out that are important just because of the word count or the allowed length of the manuscript.

But I think it's important to be able to find within the document the problem statement, the purpose statement, the research questions.

And those things often are not explicitly stated, but the readers should be able to infer them easily.

You should know from what you've read, what the purpose of the study was, and from the purpose, you should be able to infer the research questions.

So they don't necessarily have to be written like we would expect a student to write them in a dissertation, but we should be able to know what they were when we finish reading the manuscript.

The same is true, but that, uh, that the, um, data collection and the data analysis as well as the purpose and the research questions all need to align closely to the research design that the officers said they used.

And some of the things that we see, we see things called phenomenology that have nothing to do with lived experiences.

That doesn't mean you just fill the manuscript out.

It means you try to look for ways that they maybe could work, clearly write about what they did and what they learned that aligns with phenomenology.

Or you can find within their readings a different design that you could suggest.

That's tricky because it's hard to, um, especially for one of the journals I review for, I get a lot of articles that are clearly based on a master's thesis or a doctoral dissertation.

And it's really kind of tricky to tell someone who's had a dissertation approved as one research design when many of the components

clearly don't align with that design.

So you can't say, well, you're well, your dissertation was wrong.

And often you can find the dissertations online, and sometimes they just tried to pull out pieces here and there, and I've lost a lot of information.

So if you can do that, you know, it takes a lot of time, but, but it's worth it so that you can suggest to the reader.

I think that's one of the biggest things that reviewers do is, is suggest ways to report the study so that it's clear, concise, aligned with the research design, and shows how it contributes something new and moves research forward.

That's always my goal when I'm reviewing.

Thank you, Dr. Johnson. Thank you.

The next question is for Dr. Unal.

So what are the common mistakes or oversights you encounter in submissions and how can authors improve their work before submitting it for peer review? Oh, thank you, Dr. Smith.

Um, yeah, it's easy to, um, sit here and talk about all the things that are wrong with people.

So, um, submissions.

But sometimes I think when you're trying to write your own, it's easy to overlook a lot of different details.

So, um, the one, the reason I wanted to volunteer for this question is I had an opportunity to go to a conference.

It was, this was in Germany, and they had, um, an hour session where participants for the conference could sit down and meet with the editors, and there were editors from, uh, like three different journals of economics.

And all these were prestigious or, um, journals, and the editors looked appropriately distinguished.

So, um, I thought this would be something I could learn from because, um, what better way to hear it from than from editors.

So I remember the one that I wanted to tell share is one where he said, and he just wanted everyone to know that he had no problem with rejecting manuscripts, that immediately the first thing he looked for was the, um, a certain section in the article.

And if it wasn't in the article, it just went back the author, because he knew that the author would, uh, the article, the manuscript would have no value.

'cause anyone who wouldn't put this in didn't understand the importance of, um, of balance, of presentation of the material.

I thought, wow, you know, what is this? I wanna know.

So anyway, he, he said, it's limitations.

And I thought, wow, you know, I don't know that I've always included that in, in a manuscript.

I mean, I know it's something like a dissertation.

You have to do that again and again.

But have I always included it in my article submissions? I thought, well, maybe not, but now I know why it was projected.

But anyway, so this is a real simple thing.

Just remember, who knows, maybe not all editors do that, but he was a very distinguished gentleman.

He was advanced in his age, so he is been around for a while, and he represented of an important economics journal from the United Kingdom.

So he has, was an established, he would what be what I would call a credible, um, representative of editors.

So just in case you never know, maybe editors do look for that.

So one way to at least improve your chances of not getting rejected, or let's put it more positive, like the improve your chances of acceptance is just include that section.

And a limitation could always be that, you know, whatever your sample was, maybe it wasn't representative of every population.

So additional research is warranted to ensure that other areas maybe would have different response, uh, uh, results.

So anyway, I thought it was a very simple solution to, who knows, maybe that's why many of us have gotten rejected if we, um, had failed to include that limitation section.

That was just one thing.

But then in my, um, and again, that's from a reputable editor, this is just from my general, um, experience.

Um, I think a lot of times sometimes, um, authors, they, they really feel it's important to include tables.

And, um, I've been working with some journals that have this more positive approach to peer review.

They have said that instead of having people who come across with some of those comments that Dr.

Stella had, you know, what are you thinking? I mean, these authors know nothing and why did the bothers publishing this? And why do I have to read it? That may be what you think.

But these journals, one, some of those that I'm working with, they say, remember, be respectful.

And, um, there are ways to convey constructive criticism, constructive guidelines that you don't have to insult the, uh, intelligence of the authors.

And also that makes them more receptive.

They don't get defensive immediately.

So, um, I think there's a lot to be said for that.

So sometimes I find people, um, who have tables and figures that, uh, for the life of me, it's hard to figure out how they, um, contribute to the meaning of the, the manuscript.

And it's so, um, difficult to try to interpret some of the columns they're not really aligned to well.

And then, um, the headings and, and figuring out what it means.

So, um, some of these journals that encourage more positive approaches to peer review have said that if you feel that the graphics that the authors might have created might not be that worthwhile, it's good.

You might suggest that perhaps the, um, content of the graphics might be reviewed to determine if it's to improve the readability.

And also does it actually make a contribution to the manuscript? Maybe you don't, they don't, the authors don't even need it.

And if it were deleted, um, that might be a plus.

So I thought those were good comments and it might help some of the, um, authors who are submitting and also in the peer review process, trying to figure out what those tables and graphics are contributing can be, you know, it can take a little bit of time and, and, and thinking power.

And we wanna try to reserve our thoughts for more, um, important, uh, parts of the manuscript.

So thank you Dr. Smith for providing that opportunity for me to inflict this on our captive audience.

Thank you.

Thank you Dr. Al.

We got one more question for you later on.

So, um, the next question, um, this is for Dr. Rice.

Um, how do you approach providing constructive feedback to authors, particularly when a manuscript requires significant revisions or is not ready for publication? And then we talked about that a little bit in the, the earlier, how would you Yeah, and, and we've talked a little bit about that before, and I think, um, you know, adding to the, the great advice that Dr. Johnson and Dr.

Andal, um, you know, we always wanna, wanna provide feedback that's positive first.

So if it is, uh, research that's going to positively contribute to the body of knowledge positively and, uh, contribute to the industry, um, I always want to point that out and, um, uh, identify that this is valuable research that they're doing, and set the tone that my goal is to help them make this a stronger body of work.

But then I tend to focus on, uh, some of the key attributes.

What's, uh, how can we strengthen the validity? How can we strengthen the generalizability? How can we strengthen the accuracy and how can we, um, remove bias from the research? Uh, because almost all the gaps that I find will fall into one of those four areas or multiples.

And so I'll, I will phrase it in a way, phrase my feedback in a way to say, to strengthen the impact of your paper.

Have you considered doing this, you know, to, um, make it more clear that you're removing researcher bias or confirmation bias from

your analysis? Have you considered doing this? And we talk about, um, you know, diverse analysis of data.

We talk about, uh, limitations on the study.

We talk about, um, uh, a number of different things that most researchers may have done or could do to, um, uh, strengthen their paper most of the time.

Um, I would say that the feedback I give is, uh, gonna result in an edit and, and resubmission at least, I, I tend to review for Emerald.

And Emerald gives the authors three reviewers, two of which have to con submit on time to get feedback.

And then if the author then makes the edits based on the feedback and resubmits, then they give the same reviewers the opportunity to, um, provide additional feedback.

So it becomes a dialogue between the, uh, uh, they don't know who I am, I'm still a blind reviewer, but they, they're getting consistent feedback from me.

And I think that helps, um, authors as they're developing a stronger body of work for publication.

Thank you. Dr. Rice, Dr. Johnson, did you have any other comments for that? You're on mute Dr. Johnson.

Sometimes I sound better when I'm muted.

So, so I think Dr. Rice is spot on with, with his comments.

Uh, the only thing I would add is, as he was alluding to, I think feedback has to be actionable to be worthwhile Yeah.

Worth. And, and Dr. Rice said that in several other ways, but I, I like that word.

They, they need to know the, the authors need to know what action it is we expect them to take.

Because if we just make a comment about something not being right or, you know, the literature review needs more depth, that, that's not really helpful.

But if we could say, you know, in the literature review, consider these two authors who have contributed greatly to this field or greatly to this research design, and please read their work and modify this section.

That's actionable feedback.

And I just think that's the best kind of feedback we can give.

Mm-hmm. Thank you, doctor.

And to, to add to that, I, I always try to make sure the feedback is actionable without being prescriptive.

Yes. You know, I may give them a list of authors they may consider reviewing, but not require that they include those specific ones.

But I'm looking for, you know, relevancy and currency and, and, um, so making recommendations as, uh, Dr.

Dr. Johnson said that is, that are actionable and specific is, is very important.

So that's a good point.

Thank you. And then we, in the presentation we discussed, you know, timeliness.

So how much time does it take to do a review, and how much time do you actually have to do a review? So Dr. Rice, on the next question exactly the next question, how do you balance the need for thoroughness with the pressure to complete reviews quickly? And what strategies do you use to manage your time effectively during the review process? So Dr. Rice, what do you, I'm sorry. Um, I, I wasn't sure who you were addressing that to.

So, um, uh, the answer is, well, as I said, the answer is, it depends.

Every, every journal's got their own review or processes and timelines and deadlines.

Uh, for Emerald, they provide up to four weeks for the initial review.

Um, I do my best to get them back within two weeks, um, so that the author can have feedback and have an opportunity to, um, especially if it's a accept with changes, uh, feedback, um, I want them to have the opportunity to resubmit.

Um, the second review typically has less than a week for turnaround.

Um, so there's a dual review process there.

I just, I've always got the opportunity to accept it, and when I accept it, I put it on my calendar and I make sure I get it done as quickly as I can.

So, And so I review for, uh, frontiers as well and they actually give you a week.

Mm-hmm. And they're curious about that week. Yeah.

They talk to you during that week to make mm-hmm.

They check it on because they want that re they want that, um, review because they're trying to really kind of combat this idea within peer review that it just takes so long, um, to do, uh, to do this peer review.

And, and that gets me to my last prepared question, so we can open it up and have questions among, among us as scholars.

So, uh, Dr.

Unal, what are your thoughts on the role of peer reviewers and the timely dissemination of credible research? Well, thank you very much Dr. Smith. Yeah.

Um, this is an important part of peer review, which hadn't really, um, surfaced.

I mean, there's a lot that I'm totally unaware of.

So obviously, here's another example.

But anyway, um, here about peer review, it's necessary, like Dr.

Stella eloquently is, it's the language of scholarship or something more, a little bit better.

What was your phrase? Language of scholarship or something. It was nicely put The currency of scholarship Currency.

Yes. There you go. Economics. Yeah. Okay.

So anyway, that's good. It is.

But you know, when you never really get the full impact of that until it, I it's you personally.

So, okay, I'm on this team and remember I'm a reluctant researcher.

'cause the only reason I'm doing research is I like to work with students.

I enjoy it, but I'm not one of these people who's truly passionate about research.

I always thought, you know, if I could be my workplace experience in the classroom, that would be fine with me.

But now we need to do research in order to continue to work with students.

So I like it for that reason.

So anyway, I am on a team, uh, several teams, but on, in this case, one team, uh, that we had.

So we took, um, using CAB BE'S that wonderful, um, database, which tells you whether or not, uh, the journal usage should submit to is even credible.

You don't wanna go to some kind of a predatory journal.

So we went to cab be's, we found a journal, then we use the proper, uh, criteria to select one acceptance rate.

Do they accept 1%, 5%? Ours accepts 50%.

So, you know, you got a fighting chance there.

Um, and then the next thing that seems to be important lately is the peer review turnaround.

'cause I did have an experience with one that waited 13 months and I had to re, re retrieve it, re re whatever it is.

I had to say that I wanted to no longer wanna retract it.

Thank you. Yeah. So that I have to submit somewhere else 13 months and they still couldn't figure it out.

So anyway, um, so we got one that said one to two months turnaround.

So we submitted in February, and I know I always tell everybody, well, it's your responsibility to wait and, uh, a reasonable time, month or two, and then monitor the progress.

So I thought, well, I'll monitor the progress.

So I went into the dashboard to see what's happening with our submission.

And, um, initially it was pending and then it moved forward to under review.

So that was progress, but I thought, you know, what's happening, this is July, let me think, February to July.

It's like about five months. It's a long time.

So I went and looked and it was still under review and I thought, well, uh, you know, maybe they lost it.

So I then sent an email to, they got two editors and, um, sent to them just saying, um, I'm representing our team.

I was just wondering like, you know, when we, when might we expect a response? And so I thought, wait, see, well, they were good.

They answered like within an hour or so.

Uh, one it shot back and said, well, we had some problems getting reviewers.

They, we sent it out and they didn't wanna review it.

Was that, I mean, and then, uh, they said, but we now have some reviewers who are reviewing it, but we don't know how long it'll take and we can't tell you when we don't really know.

So that was the first, and then the second one, the second review editor wrote, oh, thank you so much for following up.

Um, we believe that we'll get something in, in a reasonable time, but we can't really say, we gotta have some reviewers or reviewers who are working on it.

And so I thought, okay, so I, I updated our team so at least we know what we're doing.

And most of the team felt that, let's leave it with them 50 50 chance and see what happens.

But the, the lesson learned there is that, uh, journals, I've heard that journals are having some difficulty in getting peer reviewers to take, um, a look at some of the manuscript submissions.

And it's slowing down the process.

Let's face it, one to two months turnaround time, it's now five to six, who knows.

So, um, if you wonder like if being a peer reviewer, does it make a difference? There are authors out there who are hoping to, you know, submit their manuscript, get some kind of response in a timely manner and, and either make it better and submit, resubmit it or go to another journal, but at least make some progress.

So the peer review process is an important part of people sharing their results, keeping their jobs, and you know, if you want to do something that helps to keep that currency of scholarship, um, alive and well, uh, the peer review that you do, it is something that makes a difference to the editors of journals.

'cause they also wanna get material, um, so that they can publish it.

It keeps the readers with material that is, um, out there so that they can keep their subscribers or at least their online presence.

So I thought that was an interesting experience.

And sometimes you wonder, does what I do make a difference to anyone? Like yeah, there are authors who are wondering what's happening.

Editors are thinking, when will we know? And, and so you can go out and make the world a better place in something that perhaps can be rewarding to you as a reviewer yourself.

And also it does, as I think one of our, uh, peers said, uh, it keeps you, uh, apprised of researches, uh, going on currently, so you keep your toe in the water.

So thank you Dr. Smith for giving me a chance to again, inflict this on our captive audience.

Thank you for sharing that.

I think that really sums up the relationship we have and um, kind of the responsibility that I think we have to, to give back to the field by peer reviewing. Um, So that, yeah, I think your question, I think your question was a really good one.

'cause it was about, uh, not only turnaround time, but quality of work.

Uh, you know, that's part of the reason for Emerald.

We've got two weeks to do the initial review.

'cause they actually expect us to go review the articles that are cited in the work, re read them if we're not familiar with them and make sure they're being properly represented.

We have to attest that those aren't those cited articles are properly represented.

But the second review, we can turn much more quickly because we've already gone through that level of effort.

So I encourage anybody to be a reviewer, but recognize that when you're doing it, uh, acknowledge the expectations of the journal you're reviewing for and, uh, you know, do your best to, to return, uh, work on time because you can completely, uh, delay a submission to an entire different publication cycle.

And some of these journals only publish a couple times a year.

Um, so it's, uh, important to be, be timely but also be accurate.

Oh, and maybe one thing, Dr. Rice I could add.

Um, you can also, it's not like you are just, um, a cog in a wheel.

Um, you can choose journals.

Like one of the ones I do, they actually say you can select like when you're not available.

Like if you wanna, they said nobody wants to get a peer review quest request when you're on holiday, but you know, you can actually, uh, block out times that you're not available.

So you can, um, not have to worry about, oh my goodness, they're gonna send it.

So be selective.

Find a journal that sort of is willing to respect your time also. So thank you.

Yeah. It's also important that your profile be accurate 'cause to Dr.

Smith's point that you wanna make sure you're receiving articles to review that it are within your area of competency.

Um, I get a lot from memorable because I do a lot of quantitative analysis.

There aren't many quantitative reviewers.

Um, but it's, if, if it's in your area of competence, you can re we can often review it much more quickly.

'cause you're familiar with the body of knowledge in that space.

So you're better off submitting when you apply to be a reviewer, making sure your area of expertise is as narrow as possible so that you can be prompting your replies And you can decide.

So when they send you the email, you can say no. Yeah.

Right. So, but if you say yes, then all of these other things are, um, come into play.

Yeah. Dr. Baron, I see your hand.

Oh, thanks. Um, I know there's a debate about whether peer reviewers are paid or not paid for the work that they do.

Does, is that a consideration for, for you when you, uh, choose to do reviews? I'm not paid. Um, I, I dunno if any it, I don't think most peer reviewers are paid.

We're doing it because it's, um, it's a contribution of the body of knowledge.

And occasionally the organization that puts out the journal may also have conferences and other activities.

And sometimes the, the, the peer reviewers get discounts on the conference or materials.

I know, I know with Emerald Google free access to some number of articles by virtue of reviewing, but I've got access to the library anyway, so it doesn't matter. I don't even think about it.

So sometimes it's more access or 25% off of books or some, some, you know, something like that.

But not like a a a check.

Yeah, there's no, What some of them will do is they'll give you, like if it, if they charge a article processing charge, they'll give you like so many points or they'll reduce the charge by a percentage, um, as an incentive to, as a reward for your doing that work for their journal.

You can submit to them and it doesn't come out of your pocket so much.

Yeah. That's one thing that, yeah, but you're right, Dr. Rice, I don't think most, uh, paid.

It's probably be considered a conflict of interest.

Yeah, I have, I have seen, it's been kind of interesting lately.

I, I, 'cause I have a number of students that do the dissertation to publication workshop and we've run across a number of journals that require as part of submission, the names of three people willing to review.

They are struck in many cases.

Are there other questions or Dr. Johnson, did you wanna share? I see you're unmuted.

I I was just gonna mention when we were talking about our areas of expertise, I review for one journal that's international and a large percentage of their manuscripts are not from the us.

So if you're going to review something like that, you have to spend some time understanding how research is done in that part of the world or in that country.

You know, research tends to involve, uh, approaches, evolve research, designs evolve.

Sometimes there's a research design that I've never heard of before.

And the easiest thing to do would just be say, that's not my area of expertise, but I always wanna learn something new.

So occasionally I'll take one of those on and it takes a great deal of time to really understand what the expectations would be because what I know may not really apply to that research design or to that com that country's approach to research.

So if you're doing work for an international journal, it often, often becomes a lot broader scope of the things that you have to learn along the way as you're doing it.

Yeah. I'm glad you did that.

I just reviewed my first Italian article.

It was in my industry, it was in my, uh, design area of expertise.

It was in a topic area, was comfortable with and enjoyed, had all the features except the country of origin, uh, for the article.

So I had to spend a lot of time reviewing the articles and references and local regulations.

Right, right. Yeah. But it was fun. So Are there any questions from the audience or any comments? I have been, Um, I have a quick Question.

Oh, yes. Hi.

Um, I just have a quick question.

As, as a new consider myself a baby doctor I just defended in March.

Um, how, how would you go about stepping into the process of becoming a peer reviewer? That's a great question.

Uh, and so I have, um, sometimes I get selected to be a peer reviewer, so I get volun, uh, co voluntarily to be one.

Um, and, uh, sometimes you do it, um, you can, if a journal is looking for reviewers, they sometimes have a call for reviewers and you can respond to that call with whatever information that they're asking for and volunteer yourself to be a reviewer.

How have others, um, gotten into reviewer? I know I've been invited to journals that I have published in.

Um, and so the editor was looking for a reviewer and then once I reviewed the first one, I was on their reviewer list.

Um, because you fill out the profile, um, once a journal finds you as a reviewer, they'll keep inviting you back if, if they, uh, appreciate your work. Yeah. Especially Reviews, reviews that on time.

You know, these are things that editors value. I think Dr.

Under was talking about that editors value.

Yeah. I actually knew of a journal and knew people who were reviewers there, and I sent the editor an email and, and asked to be considered to be a reviewer and drop the names of the two other reviewers and I was accepted right away.

So I guess the trick is be sure if you're using somebody's name, you make sure that they're highly respected there too.

Academic networking. Yep. Yep.

Thank you for that question. Dr. Smith.

Dr. Myers has her hand up, I think.

Yes. Mm-hmm. Yeah. Oh, thank you.

Um, uh, awesome presentation.

It helps to confirm that what I started doing is correct.

The one thing, the one thing where I really, um, need to keep working on is using the right verbiage.

Like you said, it's really good to start with more positive comments.

And then what, um, I've started doing, uh, like once I highlighted, um, one sentence and I'm like, this sounds a little bit choppy, or this reads choppy, read it out loud and fix it.

Um, I found that that sometimes seems to work.

Uh, but yeah, trying to make sure we find the right words is that that's always, I think that's every reviewer's problem, but that's what's, that's where I struggle too, The more constructive, supportive, but still Yeah. Across.

So you want them to know that this is, from your perspective, this is a problem.

So Right. Do some work in order.

Your work can be advanced if you do some work to make this more seamless and more and more readable for your honor.

Okay. Smith, can I make a comment about the value of being a peer reviewer? Absolutely. Uh, one of, one of the things that someone taught me a long time ago is never do one something for just one reason.

If you wanna be really effective with your time, make sure that you're getting several good things from what you're doing.

And, and I think I'm a much better faculty, uh, methodologist since I've been doing peer reviews for journals for a few years than I was

before, in part because I've gotten to read so many manuscripts, many of them well done.

But also because some, some journals provide you rubrics, so, you know, very explicit information on how to rate each element of the, at the manuscript.

And I work with one that even provides a long, long document of potential comments that you can use and customize for that specific, um, man manuscript that you're reading.

And many, many of those comments are extremely closely aligned with the issues that we see in the dissertations that're serving on committees for.

So it's been, it's been a huge benefit to me as a faculty person to be a peer reviewer.

It has enhanced my knowledge considerably.

I think learning from those rubrics is, and that's one of the advantages of reviewing for multiple journals, but, uh, at least the, the journals I review for, allow me to see my peers feedback after it's been provided to the, um, to the writer.

And so I get to learn from, uh, probably far more experienced reviewers than I'm, uh, how they provide feedback, what they read for what they see.

So, um, it not only helps me stay current with what's happening in the body of knowledge, but I learn from, uh, other reviewers in the industry, what they're looking for and how, how they evaluate work.

And this really helped me provide feedback to students.

Exactly. Thank you.

So we're at 7 0 3, so I just wanna do a time check.

We have one more question that I'd like to take, um, but I just wanna recognize I value the time that you spent here with us today.

And I have put in the chat a link to the survey so that you can share your feedback about the session, what you liked, what we might do differently, um, what additional sessions you'd like to see us, um, offer.

So if you wouldn't mind sharing, uh, going to that link, it'll take you maybe two minutes, three minutes, um, to assess the presentation and let us know how we can improve to support faculty, staff, uh, excuse me, faculty, students and alumni at University of Phoenix.

So, um, Dr. Le your question, Um, um, real quickly, I just, I heard somebody, we just finished the dissertation in March, I believe, Uhuh and from the alumni or alumna point of view? I just wanna say that the best thing that I did was to join, uh, the TQR, um, as a reviewer because, uh, it provided me so much background on learning to be able to publish my own research.

So if you are new, don't, don't fear, just sign up for it and you will learn on the goal.

So that's a recommendation that I can give everybody who recently graduated or thinking about joining, and they are scared.

It's, it's, it's a process.

You learn a lot and you will have people that you can ask questions and you'll get your answers.

Mm-hmm.

Thank you, Dr. Lynn.

Any other questions or final comments? Dr. Smith, I just wanna say this was a lot of fun, so appreciate you putting this together.

You did a fabulous job.

Thank you. Thank you. And thank you all for being here.

Um, it's always wonderful to be in community with colleagues, uh, and to talk about the things that we do.

I mean, I, I know you said you don't, uh, exactly love research, Dr.

Al, but you love reading and you love scholarship.

So you love Care Review. I know that. Thank you.

And, uh, I just, um, I'm grateful for all of y'all being here.

And so I am going to stop the recording, the recording of this session as well as the PowerPoint will be available on the, um, research methodology group, team site.

And I might also put together some of the other links.

So we talked in briefly about, or web of science, those kinds of things.

I'll throw those links in there as well.

And also, I think there was a, a comment about bells, so any of those other things that we kind of talked about, but we didn't have the time to go deep into.

I'll include some information about that.

Those of you that are going to be, um, reviewers for Phoenix Scholar, we will have other times where we'll talk.

So if after this you have some additional questions or we need to go through the rubric in more detail, we will have time to do that.

I think there was a question in the chat that I glanced at.

Oh. And I was gonna, something about if you do you need to have a dissertation to have a orchid number and I don't think so.

No, no. There's no need for that.

Anybody can sign up for that. Yeah. Um, yeah. Yeah.

So you're good at whatever stage you're at right now.

You can sign up for an Yeah. Go, go get an orchid number.

There's, there's three very prolific writers, academic writers by the name of Jim Rice.

And, uh, the only thing keeps us different is our orchid IDs.

Thank you everyone. Have a wonderful mind. Thank you.

Thanks everybody.