Once you've been published, it won't be long before you're asked to do a peer review.,If you're invited, take the opportunity.,Peer review is a great way to learn and to build confidence the 1st time you're asked to do appear review.,You may feel intimidated. You may feel like, I'm too inexperienced.,I don't have enough knowledge of the field.,I'm just a graduate student. But if you get asked to do peer review, you should absolutely take advantage of that opportunity.,Journal Editors are looking for young reviewers.,Young reviewers often are more up on the latest in a field than the latest techniques.,Young reviewers also tend to do a more careful job than people who have been reviewing for ions.,There was a research study presented at a conference a few years back where they traced the natural history of peer reviewers, ,and they found that the longer people had been peer reviewing, the more poorly they did the reviews.,There was a deterioration effect, because the more you do, the faster you get, the less careful you are.,So editors want young reviewers. And one of the greatest benefits of reviewing is that you will see the back end of the publication process.,So it's a great way to learn about the publication process.,It's also great for your confidence, because you'll see that not everything submitted for review is of that great of quality.,You'll realize that you can do just as well or better than many of the submissions you see.,You'll also get the opportunity to see the reviews that other peer reviewers turn in.,That's also helpful for your confidence, ,because you'll see when you get the other peer reviewers comments back that they had many of the same critiques as you, you realize that you do know something about the field.,You know what you're talking about.,And also, you'll learn something from the other reviewer's comments, because sometimes they may see things that you missed in the paper.,All right, here are some things to keep in mind if you are a peer reviewer.,The 1st thing I always like to talk about with peer review is the tone. When doing appear review, you're supposed to be looking for both the positives and the negatives.,But because you have to make a judgment on the paper, it's understandable that you naturally start to look for the problems more than the string.,As a result, it's easy to slip into a condescending and critical tone.,Just because you're being critical doesn't mean the tone has to be critical.,There's a way to present criticism in a positive and encouraging way.,I always like to picture that on the other end of this whole review process,, there's some poor graduate student who's the one who did all the work, who's the 1st author on the paper, and their confidence is on the line.,So my tone matters. I have to remind myself to be positive.,E.G. you could say something like, the Authors should delete table.,Not only is it completely irrelevant, but it also reveals their utter lack of statistical understanding.,That's a very harsh way of delivering a criticism.,Compare that two Table five contains unnecessary information, e.g.,a pierson's correlation coefficient may not be appropriate here, the authors should consider revising or omitting the table.,Notice, these are actually the same criticisms, but they're couched in a very different tone.,The 2nd version also gives specific examples of what the authors can do to fix the table, so it's more useful.,We always want to shoot for that 2nd way of presenting things.,Notice that the 2nd version focuses on the table, on the specific problems, rather than criticizing the authors.,Remember that the point is to critique the work, not the authors.,When you draft your review comments, it's natural to say things like, the authors got this wrong, where the authors should have done this.,Go back and revise that so that you are critiqueing the table or the method rather than the authors.,That makes a big difference. Also, avoid generalizations.,It doesn't help to be overly general with your criticisms.,You need to point out specific errors.,Otherwise it's not helpful to the authors. Try to use positive instead of negative language.,Instead of saying The paper is poorly written, you could say, the writing and presentation could be improved, and then give a specific example of what you mean, so it's not too vague.,The other thing is avoid lecturing to the authors.,I have a tendency to do this because I do spend a lot of time lecturing.,So naturally I want to teach the author something about statistics or something about writing.,But that's not the purpose of peer review.,In fact, it comes off as condescending.,So avoid that as well. Just so you are aware, there are different types of peer review that you might encounter.,The most common type is the single blind peer review.,This is where the authors are blinded to the reviewers.,So the authors will not know who reviewed their paper, but the reviewers will know who the authors are.,That's the most common type. Some journals instead have a double blind review.,In this case, the reviewers are also blinded to the authors authors names, their institutions.,Things,like this are blacked out. Now, it's an imperfect system, because I do review for a journal where I'm blinded to the authors.,And I have to say, if I really wanted to know who the authors were, it probably wouldn't be that hard for me to figure it out.,There are only so many authors who work in certain areas.,They have a publication history. You could figure it out if you wanted to, but it does make it harder for the reviewers to recognize authors, which can prevent bias.,More and more, journals are starting to offer open peer review.,In open peer review, nobody is blinded.,The reviewer knows who the authors are, and the authors know who the reviewer is, and the reviewer's name and the whole text of their review may be made publicly available.,And I have to say, there have been several times where I reviewed a paper, and only when I went to input my review comments into the online system did I realize that it was an open review.,And I'll tell you, knowing that your review is going to be published online tends to make you more constructive and more positive. I've actually gone back and edited my comments to be more upbeat, because I didn't want to come across as overly negative in me.,So open peer review does encourage a more friendly tone.,There's also something called post publication review.,There's a lot of this going on informally.,People comment in blogs, on papers and on Twitter.,This is a way of vetting papers that got through peer review but might still have problems in them.,And more formal channels for post publication review are starting to emerge, such as public commons.,I'm outlined in the next couple of slides how I approach appear review.,I'm just going to review this quickly.,I'll leave it there for you to go through in more detail, if you want to.,1ST I scan the abstract, then I jump right into the tables and figures.,I like to look at the data.,1ST, because that's the story of the paper, and I want to make my own judgment on the data before I read the author's take on the data.,Then I'll read the paper through quickly, just to get a sense of it.,And I'll make some high level assessments, not knit picky things, but high level things.,I'll ask myself, do the authors conclusions match their data?,That's often where a point where papers fall down for me.,Um. I'll ask myself whether or not the writing is even understandable.,That's another big picture problem you might see if you have to struggle through the text.,Another big picture comment I might make is that the paper is too long for the amount of novel information it contains.,I may recommend that the authors shorten it and greatly.,Then I'll go through and formulate specific comments on each section.,For the introduction section, the main things I'm looking for are clarity and concession and a clear statement of the hypotheses or aims of the study.,For the method section, I'm often scanning the methods to answer the particular questions, such as, how the data were collected, um Are there places biases could have creeped in?,Did the study have a proper control, or the correct statistics used for the result section? Again, I'm looking for clarity and concision, and I'm looking for the text to compliment rather than repeat what is in the tables and figures.,The same kinds of things we talked about when we talked about writing the manuscript.,Then I'll go through each table and figure.,I'm looking to make sure that each table and figure stands alone and tells a clear and easy to understand story.,I want to make sure the figures aren't misleading in any way, and that there aren't numerical inconsistencies in the paper.,Then I'll look at the discussion.,I'm looking to make sure that that 1st paragraph tells me clearly and synctly what was found in the study.,I want to know if the author's conclusions are justified or if they're overreaching.,I'm going to look carefully at that limitation section to make sure that they addressed the limitations that I think are the biggest threat to the paper's validity.,And of course, I'm looking for good, clear, concise writing.,I take notes as I go along, and then I turn this into my formal review.,You should always start your comments with a one paragraph general overview.,Before you jump into specific points, I advise you to 1st state what you think is the major finding and importance of the work.,Hopefully this is pretty obvious,, but it allows you to start with a positive and also lets the authors know what you took away as the major point of the paper, just in case they haven't conveyed that well.,And then you should jump into those positive, encouraging statements about the work.,Whenever you're criticizing somebody, you always want to start with a positive.,There are always positives. Even if there are problems in the methods, maybe they did a really nice job in the writing.,Sometimes the research question itself is interesting or novel.,You can point that out when you start with a positive, ,it makes the person on the receiving end of the criticism much more receptive to your feedback, ,and also boost their confidence after the positives state what you think are the one or two major limitations of the paper, if they're already If you're not advising editor to accept the paper as is, what are your major big picture issues with the paper?,Maybe the writing or data presentation is just too confusing.,Maybe the authors have overstated their findings.,Maybe they're missing a critical control group.,Just keep in mind that you are not supposed to reveal your final recommendation, so don't say anything about rejection or acceptance.,Then you're going to give a numbered list of specific criticisms.,I usually give somewhere between five to 15 specific criticisms.,If I'm recommending that something be accepted outright, I'm presumably going to have fewer comments.,If I'm recommending that something be rejected outright, I will also have fewer comments, because I'll just focus on pointing out those big picture fatal flaws.,If I'm recommending revise and resubmit, then I'll tend to have more specific criticisms, because I need to tell the author exactly what I think needs to be fixed.,Be as specific as possible. Generalizations are not helpful because the author can't figure out how to address these adequately.,One thing I want to mention is reviewer is not the same as copy editor.,Don't waste your time picking out every single grammar and spelling issue and pointing all of those out to the author.,I sometimes see peer reviewers who will spend an inordinate amount of time on all those little mistakes, and that's really not the job of the peer reviewer.,Journals have copy editors who can fix these errors, so focus on the big picture issues of the paper.,If the grammar needs a lot of work, if there are a lot of typos, ,point this out in a general way, and give one or two specific examples, and then tell the authors that they need to get copy editing or English language help.,In addition to the comments to the author, you may provide some comments to the editor that the authors don't seek.,I don't always provide these, but it's an opportunity to be a little more frank You don't need to worry about tone as much. If there are touchy ethical concerns with the paper, such as plagiarism, you might address these here.,Some journals will also make you fill out some kind of grating or rinking sheet.,I'll show you an example in a minute.,Of course, you always have to select your final recommendation as well.,Here's an example of a grading sheet that you might see for a journal.,You may be asked to rank the impact of the research, or how interesting you think it will be to that journal's audience, or how original the results are.,And sometimes you're asked to give an overall manuscript rank.,These ranking systems can feel pretty arbitrary.,But just try to be internally consistent.,Papers you really like are going to get high marks from you.,In general, papers you think are flawed are going to get lower marks.,These grating sheets do help remind you of all the aspects of the paper that you should be considering.,So that's the basic process of doing a peer review.,My final comment is that the 1st one you do will take you a really long time.,I think I spent a day on that 1st peer review I ever did.,This is why journal editors love young peer reviewers, because you're going to feel this enormous responsibility on your 1st review, and you're going to be extremely throw and careful.,Just know that you will get faster as you do more of these.,I've reviewed hundreds of papers in my career, and now I can do a good review, often in less than an hour, if the paper isn't too technical.,My final parting thought on this is just to review unto others as you would want to be reviewed.,Be kind, be positive. When I review quickly, I tend to be curt just out of efficiency.,But I try to remember to take the time at the end and edit my review to make sure the tone is appropriate and positive.

发表文章后，不久之后你就会被要求进行同行评审。如果你被邀请，请抓住机会。同行评议是学习和建立信心的好方法。当你第一次被要求进行同行评审时，你可能会感到害怕。你可能会觉得，我太缺乏经验，我对这个领域的了解不够，我只是一名研究生。但是，如果你被要求进行同行评审，你绝对应该抓住这个机会。期刊编辑正在寻找年轻的审稿人。年轻的评论家通常更了解某个领域的最新动态，即最新的技术。年轻的评论也往往比那些已经评论了很长时间的人做得更谨慎。几年前在一次会议上发表了一项研究，他们追溯了同行评审者的自然历史。他们发现，人们进行同行评审的时间越长，他们的评论就越差。有恶化效应，因为你做得越多，速度越快，你就越不那么小心。因此，编辑们想要年轻的审稿人。审阅的最大好处之一是，您将看到出版过程的后端。因此，这是了解出版过程的好方法。这也极大地增强了你的信心，因为你会发现并非所有提交审核的东西都具有如此高的质量。你会意识到，你可以做得与你看到的许多提交内容一样好或更好。您还将有机会看到其他同行评审者提交的评论。这也有助于增强你的信心，因为当你收到其他同行评审者的评论时，你会发现他们有许多和你相同的批评。你意识到自己确实对这个领域有所了解。你知道自己在说什么，也可以从其他审稿人的评论中学到一些东西，因为有时候他们可能会在论文中看到你错过的内容。好吧，如果你是同行评审员，请记住以下几点。在同行评议中，我一直喜欢谈论的第一件事就是语气。在进行同行评审时，你应该同时寻找积极和消极的方面。但是，由于你必须在纸上做出判断，所以可以理解的是，你自然会开始更多地寻找问题而不是优势。因此，很容易陷入居高临下和批判的语气。仅仅因为你持批评态度，并不意味着语气必须是批判性的。有一种方法可以以积极和令人鼓舞的方式提出批评。我总是想象一下，在整个复习过程的另一端，有一些糟糕的研究生完成了所有工作，他是论文的第一作者，他们的信心已经到了临界点。所以我的语气很重要，我必须提醒自己要保持积极的态度。例如，你可以这样说，作者应该删除表5。这不仅完全无关紧要，而且还表明他们完全缺乏统计理解。这是一种非常严厉的批评方式。相比之下，表5包含不必要的信息，例如，Pearson的相关系数在这里可能不合适。作者应考虑修改或省略该表。请注意，这些批评实际上是相同的，但它们的语气却截然不同。第二个版本还提供了具体的示例，说明作者可以采取哪些措施来修复表格，使其更有用。我们一直想为第二种呈现事物的方式而拍摄。请注意，第二个版本侧重于表格、具体问题，而不是批评作者。请记住，关键是批评作品，而不是作者。当你起草评论时，很自然会说诸如，作者错了，或者作者应该这样做。回去修改一下，这样你就是在批评表格或方法，而不是作者。这有很大的不同。另外，避免一概而论，过于笼统的批评也无济于事。你需要指出具体的错误，否则对作者没有帮助。尽量使用正面语言而不是负面语言。与其说论文写得不好，不如说写作和演示文稿可以改进。然后举一个具体的例子说明你的意思，这样就不会太模糊。另一件事是避免向作者讲课。我倾向于这样做，因为我确实花了很多时间讲课。很自然，我想教作者一些关于统计学或写作方面的知识，但这不是同行评审的目的。实际上，它表现得居高临下，所以也要避免这种情况。如你所知，你可能会遇到不同类型的同行评议。最常见的类型是单盲同行评审。在这里，作者对审稿人视而不见，因此作者将不知道谁审阅了他们的论文。但是审稿人会知道作者是谁。这是最常见的类型。相反，有些期刊采用双盲审阅。在这种情况下，审稿人也对作者视而不见。作者的名字、他们的机构，诸如此类的东西都被涂黑了。现在，这是一个不完美的系统，因为我确实在评论一本对作者视而不见的期刊，我不得不说，如果我真的想知道作者是谁，我可能不难弄清楚。只有这么多作者在某些领域工作。他们有出版历史。如果你愿意，你可以弄清楚，但这确实使审稿人更难识别作者，这可以防止偏见。越来越多的期刊开始提供公开的同行评议。在公开的同行评议中，没有人被蒙蔽双眼。审稿人知道作者是谁，作者知道审稿人是谁。而且，审稿人的姓名和评论的全文可能会公之于众。我不得不说，我已经有好几次审阅过一篇论文，直到我把评论放到在线系统中时，我才意识到这是一篇公开的评论。我要告诉你，知道你的评论将在网上发表往往会让你更具建设性和积极性。实际上，为了更加乐观，我已经回去编辑了我的评论，因为我不想让人觉得自己过于消极和刻薄。因此，公开的同行评审确实鼓励了更友好的语气。还有一种叫做出版后评论的东西。很多这种事情都是非正式地发生的。人们在博客、报纸和推特上发表评论。这是一种审查通过同行评审但可能仍有问题的论文的方法。更正式的出版后审查渠道也开始出现，例如PubMedCommons。在接下来的几张幻灯片中，我已经概述了如何进行同行评审。我只想快速回顾一下，如果你愿意，我会把它留在那里让你更详细地介绍。首先，我浏览摘要。然后我直接跳到表格和数字中，我喜欢先看数据，因为那是论文的故事。在阅读作者对数据的看法之前，我想对数据做出自己的判断。然后我会快速通读这篇论文，只是为了了解一下，然后我会做一些高层次的评估。不是挑剔的东西，而是高级的东西。我要问问自己，作者的结论是否与他们的数据相符？对我来说，这通常是报纸掉下来的地方。我会问问自己这篇文章是否可以理解。如果你必须努力阅读文本，那是你可能会看到的另一个大局问题。我可能发表的另一个大局评论是，这篇论文太长了，无法容纳它所包含的大量新颖信息。我可能会建议作者大大缩短它。然后，我将仔细研究并对每个部分提出具体的评论。在介绍部分，我想要的主要内容是清晰和简洁，以及对研究的假设或目标的清晰陈述。对于方法部分，我经常浏览方法来回答特定问题，例如数据是如何收集的？有偏见可能蔓延的地方吗？这项研究有适当的控制措施吗？是否使用了正确的统计数据？再说一遍，对于结果部分，我想要的是清晰和简洁，我正在寻找可以补充的文本，而不是重复表格和图表中的内容。我们在谈论撰写手稿时也谈到了同样的事情。然后我将仔细阅读每张桌子和数字。我希望确保每张桌子和人物都是独立的，讲述一个清晰易懂的故事。我想确保这些数字不会以任何方式产生误导性，并且论文中没有数字上的不一致之处。然后我来看看讨论，我希望确保第一段清楚而简洁地告诉我研究中发现了什么。我想知道作者的结论是否合理，或者这些结论是否过分了。我将仔细研究该限制部分，以确保它们解决了我认为对论文有效性构成最大威胁的限制。当然，我正在寻找优秀、清晰、简洁的写作。我边走边做笔记，然后把它变成我的正式评论。在开始讨论具体问题之前，你应该始终以一段概述作为评论的开头。我建议你先陈述一下你认为这项工作的主要发现和重要性。希望这是显而易见的，但它可以让你从积极的方面开始，也可以让作者知道你把什么当作论文的要点。以防万一他们传达得不太好。然后你应该开始谈谈那些关于这部作品的积极、令人鼓舞的陈述。每当你批评某人时，你总是想从积极的态度开始。总会有积极的一面。即使方法存在问题，也可能他们在写作方面做得非常出色。有时候研究问题本身是有趣或新颖的，你可以指出这一点。当你从积极的方面开始时，它会使受到批评的人更容易接受你的反馈，也可以增强他们的信心。在正面因素之后，请说明你认为这篇论文的一两个主要局限性（如果有的话）。如果你不建议编辑按原样接受这篇论文，那么你对这篇报纸有哪些主要的总体问题？也许写作或数据呈现太混乱了。也许作者夸大了他们的发现，也许他们缺少了一个关键的对照组。请记住，你不应该透露你的最终建议，所以不要说任何关于拒绝或接受的事情。然后你要给出一份编号的具体批评清单。我通常会给出5到15个具体的批评。如果我建议直接接受某件事，那么我的评论可能会减少。如果我建议直接拒绝某件事，我的评论也会减少，因为我只想重点指出那些大局、致命的缺陷。如果我建议修改并重新提交，那么我往往会有更具体的批评，因为我需要告诉作者我认为需要修复的确切内容。尽可能具体。概括无济于事，因为作者无法弄清楚如何充分解决这些问题。我想提的一件事是，审稿人与文案编辑器不一样。不要浪费时间挑选每一个语法和拼写问题，并将所有这些问题都指向作者。我有时会看到同行评审者会在所有这些小错误上花费大量时间，而这实际上不是同行评审者的工作。期刊有文案编辑可以修复这些错误，因此请专注于论文的大局问题。如果语法需要大量工作，如果有很多错别字，请笼统地指出这一点。并举一两个具体的例子。然后告诉作者他们需要获得文案编辑或英语帮助。除了对作者的评论外，你还可以向编辑提供一些作者看不到的评论。我并不总是提供这些，但这是一个坦率一点的机会。你不必那么担心语气。如果报纸存在棘手的伦理问题，例如抄袭，你可以在这里解决这些问题。有些期刊还会让你填写某种评分或排名表。过一会儿我会给你举个例子。当然，您也必须始终选择最终推荐。以下是您可能会在日记中看到的评分表的示例。你可能会被要求对这项研究的影响进行排名，或者你认为该期刊的受众将有多感兴趣。或者结果有多原始，有时，你会被要求给出稿件的总体排名。这些排名系统可能会让人感觉很随意，但只要尽量保持内部一致即可。总的来说，你真正喜欢的论文会得到你的高分，你认为有缺陷的论文会得到较低的分数。这些评分表确实有助于提醒你应该考虑的论文的所有方面。因此，这是进行同行评审的基本过程。我的最后一点评论是，你做的第一个要花很长时间。我想我花了一天时间进行第一次同行评审。这就是为什么期刊编辑喜欢年轻的同行评审员的原因，因为你会在第一篇评论中感受到这种巨大的责任。而且你要非常彻底和小心。只要知道，当你做更多这些事情时，你会变得更快。在我的职业生涯中，我已经审阅了数百篇论文，现在如果论文技术性不太强，我通常可以在不到一个小时的时间内完成一篇很好的评论。我对这个问题的最终离别想法就是向其他人回顾一下，就像你想被审查的那样。善待一点，保持积极的态度。当我快速复习时，我往往会因为效率而被削弱，但我尽量记得在最后花点时间，编辑我的评论，以确保语气恰当且积极。