

Secret Reviewer

ChatGPT 4.0

webmaster@marysville-ohio.com

Abstract

This document provides a concise set of rules for playing the board game "Secret Reviewer".

Keywords: Board game

Objective

In the esteemed realm of academic research, scientists tirelessly work to publish their groundbreaking papers. But, some bad reviewers and the notorious "Reviewer 2" aim to reject these papers. Scientists must collaborate to publish their papers, while bad reviewers and "Reviewer 2" conspire to prevent this.

1 Setup

- Publication Board:** Depending on the number of players (c.f., Table 1), place the Publication Track on the table. This track will show the progress of papers, either toward publication or rejection.
- Criteria Deck:** Shuffle the criteria cards to form the Publication Deck. These cards decide the fate of the papers.
- Roles Allocation:** Distribute the roles randomly amongst players. They can be *accepting reviewers*, *rejecting reviewers*, or the infamous Reviewer 2.
- Appoint the first Editor-in-Chief to kick off the game.

Players #	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scientists	3	4	4	5	5	6
Gatekeepers	1+R2	1+R2	2+R2	2+R2	3+R2	3+R2

Table 1. Distribution of Roles based on Player Numbers

2 Role Revelation

With all players closing their eyes, gatekeepers and "Reviewer 2" will silently acknowledge each other's identity. This clandestine recognition helps them in their covert mission against the scientists.

3 Game Play

3.1 Selection

- The Editor-in-Chief nominates an Associate Editor for this round.
- Players then cast a vote of confidence for this nomination. They can discuss, debate, and deduce before voting.

- If the majority favors the nomination, the game moves to the review phase. Otherwise, the Editorship moves to the next player.

3.2 Review Process

- The Editor-in-Chief draws three criteria cards. After some contemplation, one card is discarded discreetly. The remaining two are passed to the Associate Editor.
- The Associate Editor, based on the given criteria, decides the paper's fate. More lenient criteria lead to publication; strict ones lead to rejection.

3.3 Editorial Powers

As papers face rejection, the Editor-in-Chief gains special powers, escalating the game's intensity:

- Request Clarifications:** Demand a player to clarify their stance on paper acceptance. This move can gather information or sow doubt.
- Special Call for Papers:** Change the order and select the next Editor-in-Chief out of turn.
- Direct Decision:** Decide on the paper without consulting the Associate Editor.
- Choose Chief Reviewer:** A risky move. If "Reviewer 2" is chosen, the scientists' mission becomes daunting.

3.4 Veto Power

After consecutive rejections, the Associate Editor can veto the criteria cards from the Editor-in-Chief. If both agree, discard the cards. Otherwise, the Associate Editor must accept one criteria.

4 Winning the Game

- Scientists:** Their victory lies in publishing a predefined number of papers.
- Gatekeepers and Reviewer 2:** They triumph by preventing enough publications.
- An additional win for Gatekeepers: If they successfully install "Reviewer 2" as Chief Reviewer after many rejections.

Strategy

The game demands a blend of strategy, intuition, and a pinch of luck. Will the scientists successfully navigate the treacherous waters of publication? Or will the gatekeepers, led by the dreaded "Reviewer 2," stifle their progress? Engage, deduce, and find out!

Second version, keep the best!

5 Setup

- Select the Reviewer Track corresponding to the number of players and place it next to a Scientist Track. Note that every Reviewer track has an identical Scientist track on the back.
- Shuffle the 11 Gatekeeper policy mini-cards and the 6 Transparent mini-policy cards into a single policy deck. Place the deck face down on the DRAW card.
- Prepare an envelope for each player. Each envelope should contain a Secret Role card and two Ballot cards. Use the table below to ensure the correct distribution of roles:

After filling the envelopes, shuffle them to ensure each player's role remains secret. Each player should then randomly select one envelope.

Ensure the game has the correct number of ordinary gatekeepers, in addition to "Reviewer 2".

Following the role distribution, randomly select the first Editorial Lead and provide them both the Editorial Lead and Co-Editor placards. The process of ensuring players recognize their roles differs based on the number of players:

For games with 5-6 players:

1. Ask everyone to close their eyes.
2. Instruct the Gatekeepers and Reviewer 2 to open their eyes and acknowledge each other.
3. Ask all players to close their eyes and put their hands down.
4. Finally, allow everyone to open their eyes. If there are any issues or confusions, address them now.

For games with 7-10 players:

1. Ask everyone to close their eyes and form a fist in front of them.
2. Instruct Reviewer 2 to keep eyes closed but extend their thumb.
3. Gatekeepers (excluding Reviewer 2) should open their eyes and acknowledge each other. They should also note who has their thumb extended, identifying Reviewer 2.
4. All players should then close their eyes and put their hands down.
5. Finally, allow everyone to open their eyes. Address any confusions immediately.

6 Game Play

"Secret Reviewer" is played in rounds, with each round consisting of:

- Election to form an editorial board
- Review session to evaluate a new paper
- Editorial action to use publication power (if applicable)

6.1 Election

The primary aim is to choose an editorial board that will manage the review process effectively. This process consists of several steps:

1. **Pass The Editorial Lead Candidacy:** Move the Editorial Lead placard clockwise to the next player at the start of a new round.
2. **Nominate A Co-Editor:** The Editorial Lead Candidate nominates a Co-Editor Candidate by passing them the Co-Editor placard. Players involved in the evaluation of the last paper cannot be nominated as a Co-Editor.
3. **Vote On The Board:** Everyone votes on the proposed editorial board. All players, including the candidates, should cast their vote.
4. **Election Tracker:** If three consecutive board proposals are rejected, reveal and accept the top paper from the Paper Draw Deck. All players become eligible for the position of Co-Editor in the next election. Reset the tracker after a paper is accepted or a board is elected.

6.2 Review Session

The Editorial Lead draws the top three papers from the Paper deck, rejects one, and then passes the remaining two to the Co-Editor. The Co-Editor rejects one and publishes the other. Any communication between the Editorial Lead and Co-Editor during this phase is prohibited.

6.3 Editorial Action

The Editorial Lead must act on any granted power upon the acceptance of a Gatekeeper-approved paper.

6.4 Editorial Powers

These powers include:

- **Check Affiliation:** The Editorial Lead may check another player's Research Group Membership Card.
- **Special Issue:** The Editorial Lead can choose the next Editorial Lead Candidate.
- **Pre-review Peek:** The Editorial Lead can secretly view the top three papers.
- **Reject Paper:** The Editorial Lead can outright reject a paper. If Reviewer 2's favored paper is rejected, Scientists win.
- **Veto Power:** After five Gatekeeper-approved papers are accepted, the Co-Editor can veto a submission.

References

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009