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Peer Review and Scholarly Publishing

Traditional

- Review/evaluation/refereeing of peers scholarly work in the same or related academic fields/profession
- Why?
  - Quality
  - Credibility/Validation
  - Improvements to writing, flow, comprehension, and objectives (aims)
  - Suitability for publication
- How?
  - Anonymous/Blind: reviewers and authors
  - Anonymization is authors responsibility
  - Guided
Peer Review and Scholarly Publishing

Open

- Types
  - Transparent: authors and reviewers known
  - Collaborative/Open participation: invited and/or broader community; peer review documents are open
  - Post-publication: manuscript is open for review pre- and post-publication

- Why?
  - Constructive
  - Reduce conflicts-of-interest
  - Transparency
  - Collaborative
  - Quality
  - Inclusive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editor-in-chief</td>
<td>● Determines journal's overall direction, strategy; seeks new partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Writes issue editorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Coordinates editorial team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Identifies new peer reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Liaison to Editorial Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Recruits new submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reviews new submissions for aims &amp; scopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Submits articles to plagiarism software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Editor</td>
<td>● Editor and coordinator for special issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Liaison to Editorial Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Identifies new peer reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Recruits new submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Editor</td>
<td>● Primary liaison to authors post submission for publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Coordinates formatting and copy-editing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Publishes articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Promotes journal using social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Editor</td>
<td>● Liaison to software vendor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● System troubleshooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Maintains website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Registers DOIs and manages Crossref account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reviews final versions of articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Publishes articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Editor</td>
<td>● Copy editing of accepted manuscripts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Peer Reviewers  | ● Review submitted manuscripts following journal’s guidelines  
                 | ● Recommend whether to accept or reject submissions  
                 | ● Suggest new reviewers                              |
| Editorial Board | ● Advise editorial team                               
                 | ● Assist with special projects                        
                 | ● Promote journal to new communities                 
                 | ● Promote open access initiatives                    
                 | ● Recruit new submissions                            
                 | ● Serve as peer reviewers                            |
Peer Reviewing: JeSLIB Process

The Editor-in-Chief verifies that all necessary materials have been submitted and begins the peer review process.

- *JeSLIB* is configured for two reviewers per article with 21 days for review. These options as well as the default message to reviewers can be revised for a specific manuscript.
- *JeSLIB* utilizes an anonymous peer review process, which means that the identities of the authors are concealed from the reviewers, and vice versa, throughout the review process.
- The Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor assigns reviewers to the manuscript and provides reviewer guidelines document; reviewers either agree to review the article or decline.
- Those who agree to review receive an email with further instructions.
- Reminders are sent periodically to reviewers. Due date can be revised later if necessary for a reviewer.
- Reviewers upload reviews by following instructions and clicking on the link in the email they received. They recommend whether to **Accept with Minor Revisions**, **Major Revisions Needed before Acceptance**, or **Reject** the submission. Upon completion, reviewers receive a thank you email from the system and the editors receive notification that a review has been uploaded.
- Editor will make the decision if the reviewers have different recommendations; Editor reserves the right to assess reviews for fairness, constructive comments.
Peer Reviewing: JeSLIB Guidelines

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pYW4eY1YMQXw4P01LysowXacgE7kpw9QsxF1tkQtTdk/edit?usp=sharing

Best Practices (adapted from: Best Practices for Peer Reviewing: The Journal of Academic Librarianship, see link in Resources slide)

Remember: every journal embraces similar methods for reviewing, but it is good to understand the nuances a journal may have before beginning the review

- Confirm that the manuscript you have is the one you were asked, and agreed, to review.
- Read the manuscript straight-through before starting the review.
- Write a brief draft of your review (before submitting).
  - Overview of the manuscript: What is it about? Is it original? Does it contribute to the cannon or research or application in this area? Include some quick thoughts about the overall ideas/structure.
- Use concise and clear writing.
- Be positive and constructive: think - “If I were this author what would I want to read in a review.”
  - Provide details about the issues in the manuscript and suggestions for how to fix these.
- Be polite and respectful: grace and constructive criticism are combinable and useful. You are knowledgeable in the area you are reviewing, and so is the author, so think of this as a dialog between two experts.
- Use the ‘Notes or Comments’ to the editor if you need to comment strongly about a manuscript.
- Help the author understand the strengths and the weaknesses of their manuscript.
- Comment on poor citation practices, grammar, spelling, etc., but do not take the time to copy edit - this is usually covered by the journal.
- In deciding on the type of acceptance - the journal you are reviewing for will give guidance.
- When in doubt about what to write, category of acceptance, reservations about the manuscript, etc., work with the editor to help overcome hurdles or problems or get direction.
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA)

- Reduce editor and reviewer bias
  - Triple peer review process
  - Open peer review
- Recruit diverse reviewers
- Use platforms that support innovation and accessibility
- Special issues focusing on DEIA within a field
**Resources**

**General**

- **COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics**
  [https://publicationethics.org/](https://publicationethics.org/)


- Librarian Peer Reviewer Database. (2021). [https://sites.google.com/view/mlprdatabase/home](https://sites.google.com/view/mlprdatabase/home)

- Library Publishing Coalition: Resources (broad content about all areas of library publishing) [https://librarypublishing.org/resources/](https://librarypublishing.org/resources/)


**Writing**


- Hemingway Editor. [https://hemingwayapp.com/](https://hemingwayapp.com/)
Resources (cont.)

Open Peer Review

- F1000 (Faculty of 1000)  https://f1000.com/blog/peer-review-establishing-quality/
- Public Library of Science (PLOS)  https://plos.org/resource/open-peer-review/
- Morton, Lindsey. (June 14, 2022). *Published Peer Review History at PLOS: Observations from the past three years*. The Official PLOS Blog. Public Library of Science (PLOS). https://theplosblog.plos.org/2022/06/observations-on-published-peer-review-history/

Ethics, including DEIA


Self-paced Training