

## *Peer Review – Dos and Don'ts*

*Marc Los Huertos*

*March 3, 2019*

### *Rationale*

...

### *Learning Objectives*

This assignment is based on the EA learning outcome for writing and communicating:

- Understand the real-world processes and implications of environmental problem-solving and decision making.
- Speak and write clearly and persuasively.

### *What is the Peer Review Process?*

Peer review is the evaluation of work by one or more people of similar competence to the producers of the work (peers). It constitutes a form of self-regulation by qualified members of a profession within the relevant field. Peer review methods are employed to maintain standards of quality, improve performance, and provide credibility. In academia, scholarly peer review is often used to determine an academic paper's suitability for publication. Peer review can be categorized by the type of activity and by the field or profession in which the activity occurs, e.g., medical peer review.

### *Characteristics Effective Peer Reviewing*

1. The first one is fairness and politeness. Good referees always maintain a positive and constructive tone and never make personal remarks about the authors, even if the work is not good.
2. The second point is thoroughness and clarity. Authors and editors expect reviewers to give helpful feedback and provide concrete examples and advice on how the work can be improved. Here are a few other things you should keep in mind when writing and submitting a review:
  - When writing up the results, always be friendly and constructive while remaining critical and attentive. Make sure that the results are technically sound and the claims sufficiently

supported by the presented data. You should also assess the strengths and importance of the work and give clear recommendations on how it can be improved.

- You should check, whether the title and the abstract (if present) describe the work properly, whether the methods section provides enough details for a reader to repeat the experiments, and whether the results and discussion are presented in a detailed, logical, and understandable way. They should also check and report any possible ethical issues.
- A good way to organize your review is by starting with a summary of the paper, where you shortly describe what the author(s) did. Then you can include some general comments about the work, for example, some thoughts about the novelty of the findings, or the way the data is presented, and finally, you can provide a specific list describing the points that can be improved and how it can be done so. It is important to number your remarks, so that the authors can respond to them easily.
- The final step is to upload your report into the journal' to Sakai. Be sure you use the form and your ID yourself using the assigned random number.

### *Types of Peer Reviews*

... ..

*Criticize:* ...

*Persuade:* ...

*Praise:* ...

### *Steps to Review Peer*

#### *Peer Review Assignments*

```
# Randomization for Peer Review
```

```
roster <- c( "51500",
             "67593",
             "88736",
             "87952",
             "55340",
             "33714",
```

```

    "38360",
    "Heather A. Thams",
    "Chelsea D. Neill",
    "Kyle O. Olejniczak",
    "Ashley M. Quackenbush",
    "Michael W. Esgro",
    "Sarah E. Finstad",
    "Jessica Missaghian",
    "John F. Inman")

# Doesn't like this for some reason...
roster = read.csv("/home/CAMPUS/mwl04747/github/Climate_Change_Narratives/Admin/EA30SP19Roster.csv")$Stu

length(roster)

## [1] 15

sampler <- function(author) {
  reviewer <- sample(author)
  reviewer
}

sampler(roster);

## [1] Meyer, Ella K.      Budd, Susannah
## [3] Generous, Claire    Lai, Bailey
## [5] Wong, Kylie         Yi, Claire
## [7] Clark, Chris        Kaufman, Eve Alexandra
## [9] Vance, Cheyenne     Anderson, Toni Thayer
## [11] Kuhn, Emily C.      Lane, Ximena
## [13] Bullock Floyd, Makeda Randle, Jasmine
## [15] Namachivayam, Siddharth
## 15 Levels: Anderson, Toni Thayer Budd, Susannah ... Yi, Claire

set.seed(123)
repeats <- c(1,2,3)
while(sum(repeats)>0) {
  Reviewer1=sampler(roster); Reviewer1
  Reviewer2=sampler(roster); Reviewer2
  Reviewer3=sampler(roster); Reviewer3

  for(i in 1:length(roster)) {

```

```

repeats[i] = sum(roster[i]==Reviewer1[i],roster[i]==Reviewer2[i],roster[i]==Reviewer3[i],
Reviewer1[i]==Reviewer2[i], Reviewer1[i]==Reviewer3[i], Reviewer2[i]==Reviewer3[i] )
}
repeats
}

rndnumbers = sample(1000:9999,length(roster)*3);rndnumbers

## [1] 2294 2679 5742 5495 4315 9850 3798 4901 9468 4102 3849 5381 4381 3844
## [15] 6395 2790 9062 4733 3068 5867 2410 1058 5432 5010 8597 8949 9544 5504
## [29] 3871 4072 9311 2157 9735 3529 4607 8279 4144 1871 1733 2447 7404 7965
## [43] 1323 1213 7355

ThreeReviewer <- data.frame(Author=roster, Reviewer1name=Reviewer1, Reviewer2name=Reviewer2,
Reviewer3name=Reviewer3, Repeated=repeats, Reviewer1=rndnumbers[1:length(roster)],
Reviewer2=rndnumbers[c(length(roster)+1):c(length(roster)*2)],
Reviewer3=rndnumbers[c(length(roster)*2+1):c(length(roster)*3)]); ThreeReviewer

##           Author           Reviewer1name           Reviewer2name
## 1 Anderson, Toni Thayer           Wong, Kylie           Yi, Claire
## 2           Budd, Susannah Bullock Floyd, Makeda           Randle, Jasmine
## 3 Bullock Floyd, Makeda Anderson, Toni Thayer           Kuhn, Emily C.
## 4           Clark, Chris Kaufman, Eve Alexandra           Generous, Claire
## 5           Generous, Claire           Randle, Jasmine           Lane, Ximena
## 6 Kaufman, Eve Alexandra           Meyer, Ella K. Anderson, Toni Thayer
## 7           Kuhn, Emily C.           Lai, Bailey           Wong, Kylie
## 8           Lai, Bailey           Generous, Claire           Meyer, Ella K.
## 9           Lane, Ximena           Clark, Chris           Vance, Cheyenne
## 10           Meyer, Ella K.           Budd, Susannah           Lai, Bailey
## 11 Namachivayam, Siddharth           Yi, Claire Kaufman, Eve Alexandra
## 12           Randle, Jasmine           Lane, Ximena           Clark, Chris
## 13           Vance, Cheyenne           Kuhn, Emily C. Namachivayam, Siddharth
## 14           Wong, Kylie Namachivayam, Siddharth Bullock Floyd, Makeda
## 15           Yi, Claire           Vance, Cheyenne           Budd, Susannah
##           Reviewer3name Repeated Reviewer1 Reviewer2 Reviewer3
## 1           Budd, Susannah           0           2294           2790           9311
## 2           Wong, Kylie           0           2679           9062           2157
## 3           Meyer, Ella K.           0           5742           4733           9735
## 4           Yi, Claire           0           5495           3068           3529
## 5 Kaufman, Eve Alexandra           0           4315           5867           4607
## 6           Lane, Ximena           0           9850           2410           8279
## 7           Randle, Jasmine           0           3798           1058           4144
## 8           Clark, Chris           0           4901           5432           1871
## 9 Namachivayam, Siddharth           0           9468           5010           1733

```

## 10	Kuhn, Emily C.	0	4102	8597	2447
## 11	Generous, Claire	0	3849	8949	7404
## 12	Anderson, Toni Thayer	0	5381	9544	7965
## 13	Bullock Floyd, Makeda	0	4381	5504	1323
## 14	Vance, Cheyenne	0	3844	3871	1213
## 15	Lai, Bailey	0	6395	4072	7355

```
Review1 <- data.frame(Name= ThreeReviewer$Reviewer1name, Random1=ThreeReviewer$Reviewer1); Review1
```

##	Name	Random1
## 1	Wong, Kylie	2294
## 2	Bullock Floyd, Makeda	2679
## 3	Anderson, Toni Thayer	5742
## 4	Kaufman, Eve Alexandra	5495
## 5	Randle, Jasmine	4315
## 6	Meyer, Ella K.	9850
## 7	Lai, Bailey	3798
## 8	Generous, Claire	4901
## 9	Clark, Chris	9468
## 10	Budd, Susannah	4102
## 11	Yi, Claire	3849
## 12	Lane, Ximena	5381
## 13	Kuhn, Emily C.	4381
## 14	Namachivayam, Siddharth	3844
## 15	Vance, Cheyenne	6395

```
Review2 <- data.frame(Name= ThreeReviewer$Reviewer2name, Random2=ThreeReviewer$Reviewer2); Review2
```

##	Name	Random2
## 1	Yi, Claire	2790
## 2	Randle, Jasmine	9062
## 3	Kuhn, Emily C.	4733
## 4	Generous, Claire	3068
## 5	Lane, Ximena	5867
## 6	Anderson, Toni Thayer	2410
## 7	Wong, Kylie	1058
## 8	Meyer, Ella K.	5432
## 9	Vance, Cheyenne	5010
## 10	Lai, Bailey	8597
## 11	Kaufman, Eve Alexandra	8949
## 12	Clark, Chris	9544
## 13	Namachivayam, Siddharth	5504
## 14	Bullock Floyd, Makeda	3871
## 15	Budd, Susannah	4072

```
Review3 <- data.frame(Name= ThreeReviewer$Reviewer3name, Random3=ThreeReviewer$Reviewer3); Review3
```

```
##           Name Random3
## 1      Budd, Susannah 9311
## 2         Wong, Kylie 2157
## 3      Meyer, Ella K. 9735
## 4         Yi, Claire 3529
## 5 Kaufman, Eve Alexandra 4607
## 6         Lane, Ximena 8279
## 7      Randle, Jasmine 4144
## 8         Clark, Chris 1871
## 9 Namachivayam, Siddharth 1733
## 10        Kuhn, Emily C. 2447
## 11      Generous, Claire 7404
## 12 Anderson, Toni Thayer 7965
## 13 Bullock Floyd, Makeda 1323
## 14        Vance, Cheyenne 1213
## 15         Lai, Bailey 7355
```

```
combined <- merge(Review1, Review2, by.x="Name")
combined <- merge(combined, Review3, by.x="Name"); combined
```

```
##           Name Random1 Random2 Random3
## 1 Anderson, Toni Thayer 5742 2410 7965
## 2      Budd, Susannah 4102 4072 9311
## 3 Bullock Floyd, Makeda 2679 3871 1323
## 4         Clark, Chris 9468 9544 1871
## 5      Generous, Claire 4901 3068 7404
## 6 Kaufman, Eve Alexandra 5495 8949 4607
## 7        Kuhn, Emily C. 4381 4733 2447
## 8         Lai, Bailey 3798 8597 7355
## 9         Lane, Ximena 5381 5867 8279
## 10      Meyer, Ella K. 9850 5432 9735
## 11 Namachivayam, Siddharth 3844 5504 1733
## 12      Randle, Jasmine 4315 9062 4144
## 13      Vance, Cheyenne 6395 5010 1213
## 14         Wong, Kylie 2294 1058 2157
## 15         Yi, Claire 3849 2790 3529
```

```
write.csv(ThreeReviewer[,c(1,6:8)], file = "/home/CAMPUS/mwl04747/github/Climate_Change_Narratives/Admin/PeerReviewedAss")
write.csv(combined, file = "/home/CAMPUS/mwl04747/github/Climate_Change_Narratives/Admin/PeerReviewedAss")
```

	Author	Reviewer1	Reviewer2	Reviewer3
1	Anderson, Toni Thayer	2294	2790	9311
2	Budd, Susannah	2679	9062	2157
3	Bullock Floyd, Makeda	5742	4733	9735
4	Clark, Chris	5495	3068	3529
5	Generous, Claire	4315	5867	4607
6	Kaufman, Eve Alexandra	9850	2410	8279
7	Kuhn, Emily C.	3798	1058	4144
8	Lai, Bailey	4901	5432	1871
9	Lane, Ximena	9468	5010	1733
10	Meyer, Ella K.	4102	8597	2447
11	Namachivayam, Siddharth	3849	8949	7404
12	Randle, Jasmine	5381	9544	7965
13	Vance, Cheyenne	4381	5504	1323
14	Wong, Kylie	3844	3871	1213
15	Yi, Claire	6395	4072	7355

### *Instructions*

Please review 3 student blogs based on the assigned random numbers that you will received by email.

Begin by providing a summary of the paper, where you shortly describe what the author(s) did. Then you can include some general comments about the work, for example, some thoughts about the novelty of the findings, or the way the data is presented, and finally, you can provide a specific list describing the points that can be improved and how it can be done so. It is important to number your remarks, so that the authors can respond to them easily.

Determine if the author states the question(s) and their objective. Determine how the hypotheses are linked to the question(s) being ask. Then evaluate if the data were analyzed clearly (hypothesis, statistical tests). Determine if the peer reviewed literature was used to support the text and and if the conclusions were clear. Be sure to make concrete suggestions about how the blog could be improved. Finally, between 1 (best) and 3 (weakest), rank each blog on the following criteria:

- Grammar and Style
- Graphics
- Rational
- Methods
- Conclusions

- Citation (format and effectiveness) (Use CSE format handout to check on style/formatting).

Use the provided form for the peer review.