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Learning Objective

• To construct reviews that provide well-organized and appropriately detailed feedback for editors and authors.
Overview, An Art and a Science

- Why review?
- Should I accept this review?
- How should I use the scoring system?
- What should I be telling the editor?
- What should I be telling the authors?
- What should I consider in my final decision?
Why Review?

- Sense of duty/professional service
- Educational
- Helps the field (improve paper, publish good science, etc.)
- Constructive assistance to colleagues/science
- Gatekeeper
- CME
- Others
Should I accept this review?

- Familiar/expert with topic
- Familiar with scope of journal
- Familiar with journal style
- Time to devote?
- Meet deadline?
- Bias? Conflict of Interest?

PLEASE PROVIDE A "TRUE" OR "FALSE" ANSWER FOR THE FOLLOWING TWO STATEMENTS:

1. I have no significant conflict of interest related to my ability to review this manuscript.

2. I have reviewed and retained pertinent references/citations to verify my understanding of this manuscript.
The Scoring System
(Helps the Editors, Focuses Criticisms, Highlights Scope)

Rating Scale 1-5:
1 = BEST 5 = WORST

** OVERALL RATING:
** RATING, IF ADEQUATELY REVISED:

* NOVELTY:
* IMPORTANCE:
* IMPACT ON CLINICAL PRACTICE:
* RELEVANCE/INTEREST TO JACI:
* QUALITY OF ABSTRACT:
* EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN:
* STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:
* CONCLUSIONS:
* ADEQUATE REFERENCING (CURRENT OVER LAST 5 YEARS):

IF ALL REQUESTED REVISIONS WERE MADE, I WOULD RATE THIS MANUSCRIPT AT THE FOLLOWING LEVEL COMPARED TO OTHER ARTICLES I HAVE REVIEWED IN THIS SUBJECT AREA:

Top 10%, Top 20% Top 50%, Bottom 50%:

RECOMMEND BIOSTATISTICAL REVIEW?
DO YOU RECOMMEND AN EDITORIAL?
ARE YOU WILLING TO WRITE AN EDITORIAL?

Think about additional quality issues as well:
Length
Article type
Use of Tables/Figures
Scope
Language
Editor vs Author Comments

Editor
- Additional justifications for decision/scoring
- Confidence in validity, reliability
- Ethical issues
- Bias or COI issues
- If unavailable for re-review
- Uncertainties of reviewer
- Other “private” concerns

Author
- Mentions strengths and weaknesses
- Constructive suggestions
- Aim for improvement
- Objectivity- avoid personal views (use literature)
- Refer to paper/study not “authors”
Manner of Organizing Reviews
(art vs science, but be organized)

• Summary statement, Major concerns, Minor concerns and Additional issues
• Summary statement, Abstract, Introduction, Methods/statistics, Results, Conclusions, Figures, Tables, References
• Summary statement, Line number comments
Do’s and Don’ts

• Be objective
• Be specific
• Provide suggestions

• Give comments in stream of consciousness
• Belittle the science/authors
• Suggest acceptance or rejection to authors

The paper is not worthy of publication. It is hard to conclude anything and therefore, the reported findings do not provide any insight about the phenomena under study.

The authors refer to methods by XXXX, but clearly do not understand these methods…

The results appear valid, but they mostly confirm several other papers (that should be referenced, see below). Overall the study does not provide significant new insights.

The Data in Table 2 and Figure 3 are identical. Consider removing the Table.

The influence of the patient selection should be discussed.
Common Pitfalls

• Hurting feelings
• Protecting feelings (laudatory comments to author, but reject)
• Not saying enough in a review
• Giving too much detail in a review
• Destructive instead of constructive
• Discordant review/scoring

Editor: This study is more appropriate for a basic science journal since the results are not clinically impactful and are narrow and more about methods.
Author: A novel and well performed investigation….

Editor: The study design is not good enough… I do not feel confident with the conclusions, although the authors confirm a previous finding …
Author: In this interesting study, … Importantly, ….
The Final Decision

- Options of change in format or suggestion for transfer

- Written comments and scoring:
- **OVERALL RATING:**
  - **RATING, IF ADEQUATELY REVISED:**
    - *NOVELTY:*
    - *IMPORTANCE:*
    - *IMPACT ON CLINICAL PRACTICE:*
    - *RELEVANCE/INTEREST TO JACI:*
    - *QUALITY OF ABSTRACT:*
    - *EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN:*
    - *STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:*
    - *CONCLUSIONS:*
    - *ADEQUATE REFERENCING (CURRENT OVER LAST 5 YEARS):*

**IF ALL REQUESTED REVISIONS WERE MADE, I WOULD RATE THIS MANUSCRIPT AT THE FOLLOWING LEVEL COMPARED TO OTHER ARTICLES I HAVE REVIEWED IN THIS SUBJECT AREA:**

Top 10%, Top 20% Top 50%, Bottom 50%:
Reviewing Revisions

• Look over other reviewer’s comments as well
• Leeway for opinion of authors
• Re-score/decision
• Do you want to see it again?
THANK YOU!
Questions?

• For listening
• For reviewing!!!!