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OVERVIEW – THE PUBLICATION PROCESS

- Article submission
- Peer review
- Author revisions
- Editorial review
- Galley Proof
- Publication!
The peer review process

Scientists study something.

Scientists write about their results.

Journal editor receives an article and sends it out for peer review.

Peer reviewers read the article and provide feedback to the editor.

If an article finally meets editorial and peer standards it is published in a journal.

Editor may send reviewer comments to the scientists who may then revise and resubmit the article for further review. If an article does not maintain sufficiently high scientific standards, it may be rejected at this point.
Invitation

1. Do you have time?
2. Do you have the expertise in the subject area?
3. Do you have a conflict of interest?
Completing the review

*Use 3 different perspectives*

1. To understand the content/perspective of the manuscript
2. To critically edit the manuscript
3. To improve the quality of the manuscript
Writing the review

General comments
• Does the manuscript warrant publication?
• Does the manuscript require minor or major revisions?

Detailed comments
• Share detailed results of the peer review
• Provide location
• Absence of comments infers correctness
Examples

General comments

“I appreciate the opportunity to review your article along with the 2 peer reviewers. The authors should explain how these results are generalizable to other institutions. Also, the authors are encouraged to focus their paper more. It was hard to follow and understand.”

Detailed comments

“Table 1 may be better as text vs. a table.”

“Discussion, page 8, line 22-23. You may want to elaborate on this sentence more, as it is confusing.”

“How did COVID-19 impact your response rates?”
**The Journal of the Pharmacy Society of Wisconsin: Peer Review Evaluation Criteria**

Please give constructive feedback for all categories not checked as meets criteria or not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF ARTICLE BEING REVIEWED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. The content of the manuscript is appropriate for the readership and PSW’s mission. The article’s objective is clinically relevant to everyday practice. “The Mission of the Pharmacy Society of Wisconsin is to provide a unified voice, resources, and leadership to advance the pharmacy profession and improve the quality of medication use in Wisconsin” |
| 2. The manuscript offers advances to pharmacy practice. It is a new idea to our readers. |
| 3. The title states the subject of the paper. |
| 4. The introduction section contains an appropriate breadth and depth of |
Peer review criteria

- Content
- Innovative
- Detailed, organized, logical
- Results reflect endpoints; appropriate interpretation and conclusion
- Readability of tables and illustrations
- References
- Objective
Recommendation:
☐ Accept
☒ Accept if revised
☐ Revise
☐ Reject
RESPONDING TO PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK

- Article submission
- Peer review
- Author revisions
- Editorial review
- Galley Proof
- Publication!
Keep calm

- Assume the reviewers have the best intentions
- Take some time to reflect
- What are the fundamental issues that need to be addressed?
Prioritize

• Which are required edits, and which are optional?
• What edits are within the scope of your manuscript?
Respond

- Every comment should be addressed
- Changes should be demonstrated
Examples

Table 1 may be better as text vs. a table.
   This has been updated. Thank you for the suggestion.

Discussion, page 8, line 22-23. You may want to elaborate on this sentence more, as it is confusing.
   We have attempted to clarify this sentence in line 24.

How did COVID-19 impact your response rates?
   Thank you for this suggestion. It would have been interesting to explore this aspect. However, in the case of our study, we do not have this data.
QUESTIONS?
References