

# Quality of a review and responses

MiRor meeting 27 March 2019

Alessandro Recchioni

BMC Medicine

## What are we covering today?

- How do you define a good reviewer's report?
- How do you write a suitable answer to the reviewers?

# 1. What makes a **good review**?

- Report should provide **constructive** criticism
  - Aim is to help the authors improve their manuscript
  - Avoid (passive)aggressive language, or discounting the authors' work
- **Be clear** and unambiguous with your feedback
  - Authors need to understand where the problem is, and how to fix it
  - Are the authors native (English) speakers?
- **Be balanced** with your comments
  - Say what's wrong in your opinion, but don't forget to highlight positive aspects to encourage authors

- Authors worked hard to write manuscript
  - **Acknowledge limitations** (can that data really be found and added by the authors?)
  - Consider current **state of the literature**
  - Think of how long the authors will need to respond
- Am I the right person to review this?
  - If you've been invited, likely
  - Don't discount asking a colleague for help if unsure, and acknowledge them according to journal's guidelines
- Am I happy with **my own report**?
  - Would you understand your own feedback?

## Still unsure?

- Ask a colleague to **proof-read** or check your points are appropriate (and acknowledge if possible)
- If you have strong doubts about some points, it is possible to contact editor(s) and use the confidential comments section in your review (if present)
- Reports can be brief or verbose. Think if you covered all the key aspects
  - However: one-line reports are very unhelpful (This is great! This is terrible!)

## Are you totally sure?

- Go ahead and submit!

## Further observations

- Try to respect the deadline
  - You're of course very busy. Consider if you can reply on time
  - Asking the editors for a reasonable extension is common
- Make sure you are familiar with the journal's policies
  - E.g. in case of Open Peer Review and if you agree with it
  - These are normally in the invitation email, but can be different between journals

## 2. What makes a good answer to reviewers?

- Try to **answer each question** individually
  - Editors will normally ask for a point-by-point response.
  - Acceptable to link one answer to another, if two referees raise the same concern
- Provide **track changes** manuscript, in addition to clean version
  - Helps editors and reviewers quickly identify amendments
- **Justify** your responses
  - If you agree, and especially disagree with the reviewer, clearly say why you (did not) make that change
  - Difficult to read responses may delay the manuscript, and may cause misunderstanding

- Consider your **language**
  - As if you were a reviewer, it is fine to disagree, but confrontational language is not recommended
- If you are unable to perform an experiment, or disagree with the reviewer, say why
  - Is the request from the reviewer reasonable? Your chance to answer this point
- Are you concerned about some comments made by the referee? Ask the editor
  - Editors are there to keep the peer-review process fair and impartial
  - It is fine to raise a concern and ask for clarification



## Are you totally sure?

- Ensure your claims are adequately backed up by data
- Is your manuscript formatted correctly (style, declarations...)
- If your manuscript (and responses) are clear, this will help decrease time needed to peer-review
- Go ahead and submit!

## What happens next?

- Handling editor will check your responses, and decide whether to invite original reviewers or not
- Timelines vary according to journal. It is fine to ask for an update if you don't hear back in some weeks
- Hopefully your manuscript is great and accepted!

Question time

