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Peer review is ‘a process where scientists (“peers”) evaluate the quality of other scientists’ work. By doing this, they aim to ensure the work is rigorous, coherent, uses past research and adds to what we already know.'
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Benefits of reviewing

Service to your field
The filtering process and revision advice improve the quality of the final research article as well as offering the author new insights into their research methods and the results that they have compiled. Peer review gives authors access to the opinions of experts in the field who can provide support and insight.
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How does peer review work?

1. Paper submitted
2. Fits within the journal’s aims & scope
3. Desk Reject
4. Peer reviewers selected by keywords
5. Email sent to reviewer
6. Decline
7. Accept
8. Make recommendations to Editor
9. Paper will appear in your ‘Reviewer Centre’ in SAGE Track
When to decline an invite

- If you do not have the expertise to review the article.
  - Consider letting the Editor know if you are still finishing your degree and/or lack experience in the field (especially after changing fields)
- If you do not have time to review the article and cannot commit to a specific extension.
- If you have a conflict of interest with the research or authors.
Reviewer ethics

• Author anonymity
  • For double-blind journals, authors and reviewers should not know each other. Please let the Editor know if you learn the authors’ identities.

• Study participant anonymity
  • Please let the Editor know if you have some connection to the study, for example if you know someone involved in the clinical trial under review.

• Reviewer confidentiality
  • Please do not share the content of the unpublished article unless doing a collaborative review (request ahead of time).
Research done well

Evaluation criteria
First impressions

- academic writing style
- language quality
- cohesiveness
- bias-free, inclusive language
Overall

- proper reporting guidelines
- contribution to field clear
- appropriateness of literature review and references
- descriptive figure legends
Ethics

- Informed consent from study participants
- Ethical approval obtained if necessary
- Anonymization
- No signs of data or image manipulation
Methods & analysis

- Flaws in study design
- Reproducibility
- Relevance of statistical techniques
- Appropriateness of materials, methods
Results, discussion, conclusions, & limitations

• Are the results presented in a way that best emphasizes the findings?
• Are these sections free of unsupported generalizations or assumptions?
• Are the conclusions appropriate for study?
• Are there appropriate limitations and directions for future research?
Volunteering to review
Volunteering to review

- Creating an account
  - Navigate to a journal’s peer review site
  - Use good email address
  - Create an ORCID
  - Include your affiliation
  - Specify your degree
  - Add strong keywords

- Connecting with editors
  - Publons
  - Emails

Good keywords
- Curriculum design
- Teacher preparedness
- University education
- Early childhood education

Keywords to avoid
- Students
- Education
- Teachers
- Second graders
Peer review resources

- SAGE Journal Reviewer Gateway
- How to review articles
  PDF guide and videos
- COPE Ethical Guidelines
- Open Peer Review and preprint comments
- Publons Academy training course

sagepub.com/reviewergateway
Thank you for reviewing

Reviewers protect the integrity of the academic record.

Reviewers elevate the quality of the work they review.

Reviewers challenge their peers to higher standards of research and scholarly communication.
Panelists / Q&A

• **M. Natasha Rajah**, Associate Editor of *Psychological Science*, Professor, McGill University
  • Email: maria.rajah@mcgill.ca

• **Mary Beth Genter**, Editor-in-Chief of *International Journal of Toxicology*, Professor, University of Cincinnati
  • Email: gentermb@ucmail.uc.edu

• **Stephen Kates**, Editor-in-Chief of *Geriatric Orthopedic Surgery and Rehabilitation*, Professor, Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine
  • Email: stephen.kates@vcuhealth.org

#HowToPeerReview
Presenters

- **Jennifer Lovick**, Executive Editor, Cancer Control and Technology in Cancer Research & Treatment
  - Contact: [linkedin.com/in/jlovick-editor](https://linkedin.com/in/jlovick-editor)
- **Bailey Baumann**, Managing Editor, SAGE Open
  - Contact: [linkedin.com/in/bailey-baumann-editor](https://linkedin.com/in/bailey-baumann-editor)
Thank you!
sagepub.com/ReviewerGateway