

# Responsible Conduct of Research

Peer Review

# Peer Review

- Critical Part of Publishing/Granting Process
  - Quality of science
    - Personal observation – many reviewers confuse being an editor with being a reviewer. Comments on the quality of the writing are important, but reviews should first and foremost focus on quality of science
  - Significance of science
  - Alignment with journal or funding source goals

Footnote: much of this work is derived and synthesized from materials provided at the UNH RCR site:

<https://rit.sr.unh.edu/training/rcr-training/peer-review.html>

# Peer Review

- We can talk about process if you like, but one element to be aware of with regards to RCR is anonymity
  - Single blind
  - Double blind

# Being a Peer Reviewer

- Need to be evaluative or judgmental – clear yes or no to question of whether to publish or fund
- Need to provide constructive criticism for improvement
- Need to maintain submission as privileged information (i.e., not to share or use yourself)
- Potential Problems
  - Conflict of interest
  - Personal conflict
  - Unqualified reviewers
  - Timeliness of process
  - Who is chosen as a review (“Good old boys network”)

# Handling Negative Reviews

- Be professional – try not to take it personally!
- Recognize that some critiques are valid, and others may not be, so use the reviews constructively
- In my experience, how you respond in the cover letter or point by point recounting of your revision can be as important as what you actually do in the revision
  - You can (and should) argue for no change when you think it is most appropriate, but state your case clearly

# Peer Review