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Introduction

As an editor of a journal I am reliant on a team of volunteer reviewers who, in Emden’s (1996) words, make a significant contribution to the scholarship of a discipline and the work of others; yet this is often an unacknowledged form of scholarship. If a journal is peer reviewed, that denotes that there is some kind of review process of its manuscripts prior to publication, and it is this role and what makes a good and effective reviewer that is the focus of this chapter.

I will establish what exactly is peer review, why individuals become reviewers, what criteria editors have for becoming a reviewer for a journal, how a reviewer carries out the role, how they give feedback to authors and the kind of comments that are acceptable for authors to be able to learn from and use effectively in the revision of their papers or to improve their paper, should it be rejected. These aspects of what it means to be a journal reviewer will be illustrated by examples and activities that new and established reviewers can learn from.

It is also possible to become a reviewer for book publishers, for book proposals submitted in draft. This can be very rewarding, and publishers rely on such experts to advise on whether or not a book is needed and, most importantly, commercially whether students and others will purchase the book (see Chapter 6). Some individuals can also be invited to review complete manuscripts of books, especially if they have already offered constructive feedback on the development of the initial book proposal. This can also be rewarding as you can see how the book has developed and the authors acted upon everyone’s review comments as appropriate. The main purpose of this chapter,
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however, is to focus on reviewing for a journal and the role of the reviewer of journal articles.

What is peer review?

A research report (Ware, 2008) commissioned by the Publishers Research Consortium focused entirely on ‘peer review, its benefits and perception alternatives’. This report is a fascinating insight into the world of peer review and the role of journals and a link to the website where you can download the report can be found at the end of this chapter.

The report cites that:

[Peer review is the process of subjecting an author’s scholarly manuscript to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field, prior to publication in the journal.]

(Ware, 2008, p. 4)

This notion of scrutiny of a paper is also noted by Molassiotis and Richardson (2004) who offer helpful editorial advice to readers and potential authors of the European Journal of Oncology Nursing.

As an editor, the role of the reviewer is critical in the decision-making role, about which papers to publish and why; therefore, choosing reviewers for specific journals is essential to ensure a high-quality publication and for authors to know that their papers are being reviewed by someone who understands their work and who will give them constructive advice with regard to their work.

Types of peer review

Before we look at selecting reviewers and why you may wish to consider becoming one, it is worth considering the systems associated with peer review.

There are three types of reviews:

(1) Single-blinded review
(2) Double-blinded reviews
(3) Open reviews

Single-blinded review is where the author’s identity is known to the reviewer but that the reviewer’s identity is hidden from the author (Ware, 2008). Double-blinded peer review is where neither author nor reviewer know each other’s identity and it has benefits, in that unlike single-blinded review where there could be the potential for bias, it offers the opposite.
Open review is where both authors and reviewer’s identities are known to each other and in some cases are published together. It is, according to advocates of the system, a much fairer system:

... because they argue, somebody making an important judgement on the work of others should not do so in secret and that reviewers will produce better work and avoid offhand, careless or rude comments when their identity is known.

(Ware, 2008, p. 6)

Many nursing and healthcare-related journals use either single- or double-blinded peer review, the latter being the most prevalent. Whatever system is used, the ultimate responsibility for whether a paper gets published or not resides with the editor and the editor’s role is covered in Chapter 10.

The role of a reviewer

Whatever the system of review, there are specific responsibilities in the role of a reviewer. These are important if you are considering the role. To illustrate some of the responsibilities of being a reviewer as well as the kind of criteria that editors may look for in accepting an application to become a journal reviewer I draw on personal experience as an editor and being a reviewer for several journals. Each journal has its own criteria for acceptance onto a panel of reviewers (some journal links are found at the end of this chapter) but there are basic criteria that are applicable to all.

What do we look for in a reviewer?

(1) For Nurse Education in Practice (NEP) journal you need to be knowledgeable about nurse education generally and able to offer specialist knowledge in an area such as assessment, teaching and learning strategies, new technology in learning, clinical simulation and learning in practice (for examples of types of articles published in the journal that reflect these topics see http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/623062/description#description).

For more practice-focused journals such as Journal of Clinical Nursing (JCN) (for access to published articles that reflect the breadth of specialist topic areas see http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/journal.asp?ref=0962-1067).

(2) NEP journal also looks for some subject specialist knowledge - either in relation to a field of practice such as mental health, health promotion and critical care, or in aspects of research, especially the conduct of research and the methodologies used. Most reviewers have experience of both of these and we require every applicant to complete a reviewer expertise form, which enables me as editor to access the right person for the
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review. For other journals such as Nursing in Critical Care (http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=1362-1017) or Intensive and Critical Care Nursing (http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/623043/description#description) there is an expectation that the reviewer has expertise is the field of critical and/or intensive care as an essential requirement. Most journals now have support for reviewer websites where you can download information on reviewing and related activities (e.g., see http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/reviewershome.reviewers/reviewersguidelines). However, in the area of methodologies, for example, some reviewers are not nurses or educators but are from other disciplines. On NEP, for example, there are librarians, statisticians and information scientists who give a valued contribution to the review process and, as Pierson (2011, p. 3) indicated, reviewers are selected based on their expertise relevant to the content of the manuscript. This advice can be found in the excellent publication produced by Nurse, Author & Editor for Wiley-Blackwell who have excellent resources for authors, reviewers and editors (for reviewers support resources see http://www.nurseauthoreditor.com/forreviewers.asp).

(3) It is preferable for a reviewer to have some personal publishing experience, but this is not a compulsory requirement for all journals. As an editor I choose a combination of different experiences in reviewers and often new reviewers are matched with more experienced ones. It is also important to give feedback to new reviewers to ensure they continue to undertake the role and develop their skills as part of their professional development.

(4) It is essential that reviewers have a commitment to promoting scholarship, as the feedback they give is not only evidence of their own scholarly contribution (Emden, 1996) but also their contribution to the scholarship of others and therefore, the scholarship of the wider discipline.

(5) Editors are responsible for ensuring that a reviewer has the requisite skills and knowledge to give constructive feedback not only to authors but also to editors who have the decision-making responsibility of whether to reject a paper or ask for revision. Editors also have responsibility for making the initial review of articles submitted to ensure that reviewer’s time is not wasted in reviewing articles that would need significant revision or possibly have been sent in to the wrong journal in the first place (see Chapter 11 for editorial process).

What do we expect from reviewers?

Reviewers are expected to provide editors with timely and appropriate comments on an author’s submission. Timely means there will be set minimum time limits for reviewers to return their reviews and when that deadline passes they normally receive a reminder, periodically. In some journals like NEP if there is no response after a set time the reviewer is ‘un-invited’ from the review process of the paper to ensure a timely response to authors on their work.
This does not always happen, but most of the time it works as the editor will have assigned more than two reviewers to the process. Very efficient electronic submission and process management tools exist that enable editors to identify at least two main reviewers and also two alternative reviewers, to ensure that there is continuity of reviewers. Key expectations in addition to the aforementioned are given in the following text.

**To be constructive in their comments to authors**

This is possibly the most important aspect of what we expect from reviewers after making a decision for the editor on whether to accept or reject an article or ask the author(s) to make revisions. The feedback should follow what has been asked for by the journal guide for reviewers or the template used for electronic submission of the review (e.g. see Boxes 11.1 and 11.2).

The reviewer is asked to comment on various aspects of the article - much like giving feedback and marking of a student's assignment - the same principles apply, and for those wishing to review but who think they do not have the skills, if you are good at marking and giving constructive feedback to students and have received positive feedback yourself about this then you have the skills.

Regardless of the type of feedback requested, it needs to be constructive. Let us look at some examples using Pierson’s (2011) framework as a guide (additional ones can be found in Pierson (2011) guidance for reviewers) (Table 11.1). The examples cited here are all from real reviewer comments I have seen as an editor, although some of these have been combined to illustrate what

---

**Box 11.1 Reviewer guidance (general principles of good practice)**

- Read the article first to get a general overview of its content.
- Undertake a more detailed reading of the article to determine if it is easy to understand.
- Consider all aspects of the message the author(s) are trying to convey.
- Does the author use a large number of abbreviations and/or acronyms that detract from reading the article?
- Is it possible to discern whether the author's first language is not English?
- Is the grammar and structure of the article in keeping with what you would expect from an author submitting a paper to an international peer-reviewed journal?
- Is the referencing style in keeping with the author guidelines?
- Has the author followed the author guidelines for submission of the paper?
Box 11.2  Reviewer guide for *Nurse Education in Practice* (NEP) – key issues

**Specific reviewer comments for the author**

*Does the article:*

1. Meet the aims and scope of NEP? Yes/No  
   Comments:

2. Adhere to the recommended format for journal articles? Yes/No  
   Comments:

3. Exceed the recommended word limit? Yes/No  
   Comments:

4. Are the aims of the article clearly stated? Yes/No  
   Comments:

5. Is the cited literature relevant and reflect current views? Yes/No  
   Comments:

6. Provide a new perspective/innovation in nurse education practice and/or healthcare education generally? Yes/No  
   Comments:

7. Provide an understanding of its content and/or applicability for an international readership? Yes/No  
   Comments:

**For research papers**

8. Does the article outline the research design, including methodologies and methods that are well justified? Yes/No  
   Comments:

9. Are access/ethical issues discussed? Yes/No  
   Comments:

10. Are data analysis/findings clearly indicated and discussed? Yes/No  
    Comments:

11. Is the statistical data (if any) accurate/clearly represented? If you are not comfortable reviewing stats please advise. Yes/No  
    Comments:

...............................................................


Overall comments on the paper
Here the reviewer makes an overall judgement on the article that is supported by comments in each of the relevant categories, including possible confidential comments to the editor on issues such as suspected plagiarism, which the editor will need to investigate.

Recommendations
Due to electronic submission of articles and reviewer decisions, the categories open to the editor has now been expanded to take account of a range of feedback options, which has improved the editor's communication with authors. Reviewers are asked in the review, however, to make an initial judgement on the main categories of either revision: minor or major with reconsideration by the reviewer; more suitable for publication in another journal or reject and not suitable for publication in the journal. These comments are supported by detailed feedback to authors together with comments in each of the essential categories required.

What are the basic and specific guidelines the reviewer may use in the review of an article?
As you can see from Table 11.1 there are key issues that reviewers are required to consider when reviewing articles and how reviewers are meant to respond to in terms of feedback to authors.

In Box 11.1 you can see the general principles of good practice in reviewing any article and in Box 11.2 the more specific requirements you may be required to complete by the editor. The one illustrated here is from NEP. It is anticipated that any reviewer would adopt the basic principles of review in addition to the more specific guidelines of the journal itself.

Activity 1
(1) Identify a journal that you believe you could review for. See if there are any call for reviewers in the online pages, and if you think you can do this then apply using the guidance provided.
(2) Pick out a random paper from a journal you are familiar with and read regularly. Imagine you are seeing this for the first time as a reviewer and undertake a review using some agreed guidance (a template is seen in Box 11.1 and a specific reviewer one in Box 11.2).
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Table 11.1 Examples of feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas for feedback (general)</th>
<th>Unhelpful comments</th>
<th>Constructive comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims of the article</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>The aims of the article do not appear to reflect what the author has written about and also is not reflected in the title of the article. Recommend that they re-visit the aims again and consider amending the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The literature used in the article</td>
<td>Not very good. Many dated references, which do not add anything to the evidence.</td>
<td>Although the author has used supporting evidence, they have not undertaken account of more recent literature available on the topic (see examples). While the references used are still valid, they need to demonstrate the additional up to date ones as well to show that they are using best evidence in their study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and typographical issues</td>
<td>This is appalling throughout and authors need to consider use of English language in future papers.</td>
<td>It is apparent that the author’s first language is not English due to grammar and sentence construction. I would advise that they seek advice from someone who has first language English or who has published in international English language journals previously. The basis of the article is good with potential for publication. The typo’s in the paper are, however, not acceptable and the author needs to have the paper proof read before any re-submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research methodology, methods and data analysis</td>
<td>The author clearly has not used phenomenology and not sure that they completely understand it in relation to the methods used and subsequent analysis.</td>
<td>There are major issues with the research design section of this paper. The author states that the methodology was phenomenology and reflected the experience of the key participants. However, they appear to have used a short survey of some kind with open-ended questions to which they have analysed using narrative analysis and state that this reflected the experience of the participants in relation to the questions asked. This is confusing and does not meet the standard required for the journal as it impacts on the findings and the subsequent discussion and recommendations. On this basis, the article does not meet the journal’s expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas for feedback (general)</th>
<th>Unhelpful comments</th>
<th>Constructive comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical issues</td>
<td>None at all noted.</td>
<td>The author does not mention any ethical issues in the research section of the article, although does indicate that participants could opt out of the study if they wished to. As this article focused on interview of service users, this is of some concern that no ethical approval appears to have been given. It may of course be an oversight on behalf of the author in writing up the article, but they need to inform the editor that approval had been given before any further decision is made. It is essential that in any article involving participants, whether students or service users, some reference is made to request for ethical approval or advice from an ethics committee to determine if it is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of any plagiarism (1)</td>
<td>None that I can see although not entirely familiar with all the literature in this field.</td>
<td>Using the journal check system for plagiarism it is evident that there is some self-plagiarism from another published paper linked to this study. On comparing both papers there is a large part of the literature review that has been used in this paper from the previously published one. This is not good practice and the author needs to take cognisance of this for any future publications. It may of course be a simple misunderstanding of the protocols for publishing from same study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of any plagiarism (2)</td>
<td>The author has plagiarised sections from a paper I wrote in 2006! and also sections from another author in the same field but passing it off as their own! Unbelievable bad practice.</td>
<td>On reading the paper I was drawn to key aspects of the literature review and also aspects of the discussion section and thought that it looked familiar. The actual paragraphs in question were from a paper I had previously published on this subject in 2006. On further reading it became clear that there were other sections that were not attributed to anyone, which were directly lifted from another colleague’s published work and assumed to have been the author’s own work. This was clearly not evidence of any confusion in publishing protocols and the author needs to be advised of the seriousness of the situation and a decision made as to any further work being considered for publication in this journal. I realise that this places the editor in a difficult position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Be willing to help authors develop their papers for publication

Reviewers need to be prepared to offer their experience and expertise, together with a willingness to help authors develop their paper for publication. We can see from the examples in Table 11.1 that there is a difference between one reviewer and another who is prepared to offer constructive advice to authors. New authors are particularly grateful for this supportive approach, even if their paper is rejected. Editors have a responsibility to monitor very negative and unhelpful reviewer comments and, if necessary, to modify or add to in order to help the author. It is also editors’ responsibility to communicate with reviewers to give them feedback about the quality of their reviews. Although it is appreciated that this is a voluntary role, in agreeing to become a member of a panel of reviewers there is an expectation of good feedback to help authors and, of course, by doing so add value to the scholarship of the discipline.

Advise editors on the overall quality of the papers they review

In either accepting an invitation to review for a journal (and new systems enable editors to access potential reviewers through linked databases, such as SCOPUS in Elsevier journals) or responding to a call for reviewers and being accepted, it is taken for granted that advising the editor on the overall quality of an article as well as key aspects of it as highlighted in Table 11.1 is essential for the editor to make a decision about the manuscript. This becomes even more important when two reviewers in a double-blinded peer-review system have very opposing views about the quality of the article for publication in a specific journal. Obviously, if there are comments on plagiarism then this overrides the main comments due to the potential damage to the journal itself in terms of its reputation and also any outcome for the author concerned.

Keep to deadlines for return of reviewed papers

When reviewers accept the role they will normally be given some kind of induction to the journal with regard to time for reviewing an article. It is usually specified in the letter of invitation to review the article and also advice on what to do should they be unable to meet this deadline or wish their name to be suspended from reviewing for a period. It is important to advise the editorial office and editor as soon as possible if this is the situation. Reasons vary from family bereavement, hospitalisation, holidays, periods of sabbaticals or pressure of work.

Meeting deadlines is important if the journal is to retain a reputation for short turnaround in decisions about articles. There are periods from personal experience when the deadlines have to be extended and authors who inquire are made aware of this. This often occurs from about middle of July to middle of September, mainly due to reviewers and editorial team members taking their holidays or having sabbaticals to undertake extended study or
research. The main issue is keeping editors informed as much as possible about change in circumstances so that they do not add to any pressure or distress by sending electronic pre-organised messages. However, if reviewers persistently refuse to carry out reviews they are normally removed from the panel of reviewers.

Keep up to date with what is happening in nursing

This requirement for becoming a reviewer might seem like common sense. However, it becomes apparent that when reviewers send back their comments, even though in general they are very positive, that one area where advice to authors is of value is how their article fits in to the bigger picture of what is either happening in their discipline or whether they have taken account of the author's understanding of the international context. In reviewing for an international journal this is an essential requirement and, from personal experience, having to consider the wider context has meant reading around subjects and adding to one's own body of knowledge about the topic being reviewed and how it applies in other countries worldwide. It is astounding how 'ethnocentric' authors are, however, in how they view the world around them in relation to making their articles either easily understood by readers in other countries or including literature from outside their own country in the evidence base to their articles. Of course, this is not always a requirement but the authors need to make clear to readers what they are talking about and of course explaining the dreaded abbreviations and acronyms! Reviewers will pick up on these and this could make a difference to whether or not they recommend acceptance, revisions or rejections.

Reviewing for an international nursing education/practice journal: additional issues

Take into account an author's writing in English as a second language

As mentioned, it is essential that reviewers recognise whether or not English is the first language of the author. It is often easy to see this, as the author will identify the country the study may have been carried out in, but this is not always apparent. Of course, it could be that the author has just written a paper that includes poor sentence construction, grammar and lack of care. This latter paper may have already been reviewed on submission by the editor and rejected prior to review with advice to the author on future quality of their submission to that or any other journal. If it is obvious the author's first language is not English then guidance can be offered as to how to improve this and many journals now have additional services that can be accessed to help authors with this aspect of their written work. It is essential that this is conveyed in a sensitive manner to the authors, either by the reviewer or by the editor. Most authors will welcome this additional support. Obviously, if the paper as a whole is not acceptable because the English is so poor that it would
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...take major revision and extended time to develop, the author is advised of this and normally rejected. If there is potentially new insight into a field of practice that can be discerned, for example from evidence presented, then an editor may recommend that they withdraw the paper at this time and consider the reviewer comments, find assistance in re-drafting their paper and re-submitting as a new submission in the future. This is not a complete rejection of the paper but offers an opening for an author who is serious about publishing their work to work on their article without the additional pressure of deadlines. It also encourages authors to write in international journals where English is the main medium of communication and adds to the evidence base of a discipline, as well encouraging transnational communication.

Applicability of papers for different international and cultural contexts

Aspects of this have already been noted, such as not being ‘ethnocentric’ in writing an article and explaining the context surrounding the topic of the article, an example is the continual reference to the NMC or the NHS or SHA’s without thinking if someone reading the article in another country will know what these are or the documents referenced with them if no context to their use has been made. Reviewers need to ensure that the editor is made aware of this but in many instances if this is a major issue, the article can often be rejected prior to review. Many journals have an increasing number of manuscripts being submitted and competition for publication is increasing. All journals are allocated a page budget for their papers if they have both electronic and paper-based versions. Of course, open access journals and other new online only journals may have a different model of working, but even here the quality of the publications are still important and they also have various peer-review systems that adopt similar structures to those discussed here.

Some of the issues in this chapter clearly have messages for reviewers or potential reviewers about their own writing for publication journeys; reviewing for a journal also helps the reviewer identify with issues they had not considered in their own endeavour to write for publication.

What the editor and publisher can do for the reviewer?

Reviewing for a journal is not a one-way process. Editors and publishers also have a responsibility to reviewers; without them there would not be peer review and despite the discussions about the value of open access journals and their peer-review systems as well as the ability of academics working in universities to be able to upload work that may not have been peer reviewed internally, Ware (2008, p. 4) highlights that:

peer review is widely supported by academics, who overwhelmingly (93%) disagreed in our greatly helps scientific communication and believed (83%) that without peer review there would be no control.
This finding is based on respondents from the Thomson Scientific database and the number of respondents who could respond to all questions related to peer review was 3040 and the number of editors who responded to their questions was 632 - the respondents were from all subject areas and disciplines -from science journals and arts and humanities as well as medical and nursing journals.

The editor should be prepared to give feedback on the skills and contribution of the reviewer to both the authors and to the overall quality of the journal’s publications. Many journals announce annually the names of all those reviewers who have reviewed papers for them in the previous 12 months and this is valuable in terms of demonstrating to their peers and managers that they are making a contribution to the scholarly community as a whole in their discipline and subject specialist field.

The publisher can also contribute to the value of the reviewer in the publishing process. Although financial remuneration is not an option for most journals, often the publisher will enable other options for reviewers such as a reduction in cost of journal subscription, access to other resources within the review process such as access to online abstracts, publications and other material to help in the review process as well as for their own scholarly use.

Some reviewers who have made significant contribution to the journal’s peer-review process can be invited to become members of international advisory or editorial boards. This is of added value where this kind of ‘academic presence’ is important to their careers.

Why become a reviewer?

There are three main reasons that we can consider for becoming a reviewer, some of which I have alluded to in previous sections. These are:

(1) Personal and professional development.
(2) Keeping abreast of developments in nurse education.
(3) Contributing to scholarship of others.

We can consider these in turn.

Personal and professional development

The reviewer may apply to become a reviewer in response to a call for reviewers or be invited via an integral system to the review process; they may have been recommended by a reviewer who is unable to review at the time required or who may suggest that the person nominated has more expertise in the focus of the article. This may be a personal choice on behalf of the individual in terms of their own personal development or may be something they have discussed with a mentor or as part of their ongoing professional development.
Keeping abreast of developments in nurse education/nursing practice/research

When discussing with reviewers during writing for publication workshops, some reviewers state that reviewing not only helps them with their own writing skills, but in reading and reviewing articles regularly it also enables them to keep abreast of developments in a specific field or topic, which subsequently supports their evidence-based teaching.

Contributing to scholarship of others

For many, this is possibly a more altruistic reason for becoming a reviewer. For many, it is a genuine decision that extends from their own work and supporting others. Being a reviewer is a key role for editors and publishers, including being essential to the quality of what a journal publishes but also to its reputation in the academic and publishing fields. Reviewers are in essence the gatekeepers to quality evidence-based publications as well as offering their expertise to assist in the development of authors and their work.

Summary

Becoming and being a reviewer is a key role in writing for publication practice. It is as Emden (1996) states also ‘an act of scholarship’. It is important that not only those who work in a higher education environment consider becoming a reviewer but also experienced practitioners who have specialist knowledge and skills relevant to the field in which authors submit their articles to either a generalist or specialist journal. I would like to end with the same quote I used in my editorial on the peer-review process (Holland, 2002, p. 71) from Emden’s paper, where she states that:

Hardy (1991) states that ‘accepting the role of reviewer means prestige is being conferred upon you’. It is timely, therefore, as nursing journals proudly declare their peer-reviewed status, that those who participate in the process acknowledge the scholarly significance of their work. By openly articulating the nature or unique style of our work, we might also experience the benefits of a peer-review process.
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