

Reviewing manuscript

Tony Palmer
Animal Production Institute
Grahamstown



Introduction

The anonymous peer-review system is central to scientific research. Carefully executed reviews can substantially improve the quality of a paper, and in turn the abilities of the author. The review process can also be frightening to inexperienced authors, and the comments of reviewers need to be taken in the correct light. Reviewers who are overly interested in structure rather than content can be of disservice to authors.

Reviewing papers

Ethics of review
Confidentiality
Responsibility
Scientific integrity
Sensitivity



Reviewing papers

How do I get invited to review?
Submitting papers to the journal
Being available
Doing the job by due date
Being principled – have a history of sensitivity but strict reviewing pattern
Doing a thorough job that helps the editor



Reviewing papers

Some rules for reviewers

Print it out and read it quietly. Don't rush.
Is the document technically correct and structured according to journal guidelines. You need to have an idea of different technical conditions that the journal sets for length, content, layout, figures, etc.
Read recent papers from the journal
Is the recent literature covered?
Language – does the English need to be improved?
Is the tense consistent throughout the text?



Some rules for reviewers (cont.)

Statistics? Are the results correctly analyzed and interpreted. This is often most difficult part for the reviewer as we don't always have experience of the possible statistical methods. Get help or indicate to the editor in your report that you are not confident about reviewing this content.

Are the results reflected adequately in the Discussion? Authors have the tendency to elevate the significance of the results!!!



Reviewing papers

- Developing the comments
- Final submission



Review Processes

- Review processes
 - Open – everyone is visible
 - Single blind (authors visible to reviewers only)
 - Double blind (neither authors nor reviewers visible)



Authors Responding to editors (and reviewers)

The review process can also be frightening to inexperienced authors, and the comments of reviewers need to be taken in the correct light. Reviewers who are overly interested in structure rather than content can be of disservice to authors.



Example paper plus reviewers comments

- Go to pdf version with comments
 - Document how you have dealt with each comment
 - Change text and presentations if necessary
 - Rebuttal of statements that you can defend



Thank you

