

# Computing in Science and Engineering

## Decision Letter (CiSE-2018-08-0140)

**From:** cise@computer.org

**To:** karthik.ram@gmail.com, cboettig@gmail.com, scott@ropensci.org,  
noam.ross@gmail.com, maelle.salmon@yahoo.se, stefanie@ropensci.org

**CC:**

**Subject:** Computing in Science and Engineering, CiSE-2018-08-0140 - minor revision required

**Body:** Computing in Science and Engineering, CiSE-2018-08-0140  
manuscript type: SI: Reusable Software  
"A Community Of Practice Around Peer-review For Long-term Research  
Software Sustainability"

Dear Dr. Karthik Ram,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been tentatively accepted for publication in Computing in Science and Engineering, subject to your accommodation of the reviewers' requests for minor revisions.

Your minor revision is due before 12-Oct-2018. Please note that this due date may be different if your paper was submitted to a special issue. Please email the peer review administrator, Ms. Clarissa Nemeth, at cise@computer.org if you have questions.

The reviewer and editor comments are attached below for your reference. Please maintain our 7,200-word limit as you make your revisions. If this is a special issue submission, the limit may be 6,000 words.

NOTE: All revisions must be formatted in the submission template, <http://ems.computer.org/public/files/template.dotx>, before peer review can continue. For instructions on how to use the template, download the PDF guide here, <http://ems.computer.org/public/files/template-instructions.pdf>

To upload your revision and summary of changes, log on to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/cise-cs>, click on your Author Center, click on "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under column named "Actions," click on "Create a Revision" next to the above manuscript number.

Also, highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. [Note: We do not accept LaTeX or LaTeX-sourced files.]

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be required to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. Also, please document any changes you made to the original manuscript.

If you have any questions regarding our policies or procedures, please refer to the magazines' Author Information page linked from the Instructions and Forms (top right corner of the ScholarOne Manuscripts screen) or you can contact me.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Best,

Ms. Clarissa Nemeth  
Administrator  
Computing in Science and Engineering  
cise@computer.org

\*\*\*\*\*

Associate Editor comments

Editor

Comments to the Author:

Thank you for your submission. We would like to ask you to proceed to make minor revisions as suggested by the reviewers.

Thank you for your contribution to this special issue.

Reviews:

Please note that some reviewers may have included additional comments in a separate file. If a review contains the note "see the attached file" under Section III A - Public Comments, you will need to log on to ScholarOne Manuscripts to view the file. After logging in, select the Author Center, click on the "Manuscripts with Decisions" queue and then click on the "view decision letter" link for this manuscript. You must scroll down to the very bottom of the letter to see the file(s), if any. This will open the file that the reviewer(s) or the Associate Editor included for you along with their review.

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Accept If Certain Minor Revisions Are Made

Comments:

See review report

Additional Questions:

1. How relevant is this manuscript to the readers of this periodical? Please explain your rating in the Detailed Comments section.: Very Relevant

2. To what extent is this manuscript relevant to readers around the world?: The manuscript is of interest to readers throughout the world

1. Please summarize what you view as the key point(s) of the manuscript and the importance of the content to the readers of this periodical.: See review report

2. Is the manuscript technically sound? Please explain your answer in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

3. What do you see as this manuscript's contribution to the literature in this field?: See review report

4. What do you see as the strongest aspect of this manuscript?: See review report

5. What do you see as the weakest aspect of this manuscript?: See review report

1. Does the manuscript contain title, abstract, and/or keywords?: Yes

2. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

3. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references (maximum 12-unless the article is a survey or tutorial in scope)? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: References are sufficient and

appropriate

4. Does the introduction clearly state a valid thesis? Please explain your answer in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

5. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

6. Is the manuscript focused? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

7. Is the length of the manuscript appropriate for the topic? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

8. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript in the Detailed Comments section.: Easy to read

9. Please rate and comment on the timeliness and long term interest of this manuscript to CiSE readers in the Detailed Comments section. Select all that apply.: Topic and content are of immediate and continuing interest to CiSE readers

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice in the Detailed Comments section.: Excellent

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept If Certain Minor Revisions Are Made

Comments:

This is an excellent paper on an important topic of broad interest. The authors have done outstanding job of analysing a chaotic situation in scientific software, and proposed a system that is already greatly improving the situation. It deserves a wide audience, and is likely to be highly cited and read.

I would love to see at least one figure, such as a schematic or data visualisation in this paper.

p. 6 line 44: "One particular software package we rely on heaving is the" -> "heavily"

Additional Questions:

1. How relevant is this manuscript to the readers of this periodical? Please explain your rating in the Detailed Comments section.: Very Relevant

2. To what extent is this manuscript relevant to readers around the world?: The manuscript is of interest to readers throughout the world

1. Please summarize what you view as the key point(s) of the manuscript and the importance of the content to the readers of this periodical.: They key point is that software can be treated as a scholarly product by applying a special kind of peer review based on industry standards of code review. This is important because it raises the status of code and promotes programming practices that result in higher quality code that will be more useful to more people for a longer period of time. It also gives traditional academic recognition to the code authors, which is important for supporting the development of high quality scientific software.

2. Is the manuscript technically sound? Please explain your answer in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

3. What do you see as this manuscript's contribution to the literature in this field?: The description of the peer review system that the authors have developed, and their motivation for doing so.

4. What do you see as the strongest aspect of this manuscript?: The detailed analysis of the challenges with research software, and how the authors' project addresses these.

5. What do you see as the weakest aspect of this manuscript?: Lack of visualisations or figures of any kind.

1. Does the manuscript contain title, abstract, and/or keywords?: Yes

2. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

3. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references (maximum 12-unless the article is a survey or tutorial in scope)? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: References are sufficient and appropriate

4. Does the introduction clearly state a valid thesis? Please explain your answer in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

5. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

6. Is the manuscript focused? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

7. Is the length of the manuscript appropriate for the topic? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

8. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript in the Detailed Comments section.: Easy to read

9. Please rate and comment on the timeliness and long term interest of this manuscript to CiSE readers in the Detailed Comments section. Select all that apply.: Topic and content are of immediate and continuing interest to CiSE readers

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice in the Detailed Comments section.: Award Quality

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Accept If Certain Minor Revisions Are Made

Comments:  
See attachment.

Additional Questions:

1. How relevant is this manuscript to the readers of this periodical? Please explain your rating in the Detailed Comments section.: Very Relevant

2. To what extent is this manuscript relevant to readers around the world?:  
The manuscript is of interest to readers throughout the world

1. Please summarize what you view as the key point(s) of the manuscript and the importance of the content to the readers of this periodical.: Introduces the reader to the rOpenSci peer review ecosystem and publishing process.

2. Is the manuscript technically sound? Please explain your answer in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

3. What do you see as this manuscript's contribution to the literature in this field?: An example of a peer review methodology and pipeline for publishing.

4. What do you see as the strongest aspect of this manuscript?: An example of

code peer review that works for the target community.

5. What do you see as the weakest aspect of this manuscript?: Adherence to template guidelines and proofreading for errors and inconsistencies.

1. Does the manuscript contain title, abstract, and/or keywords?: Yes

2. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

3. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references (maximum 12-unless the article is a survey or tutorial in scope)? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Important references are missing; more references are needed

4. Does the introduction clearly state a valid thesis? Please explain your answer in the Detailed Comments section.: Yes

5. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

6. Is the manuscript focused? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

7. Is the length of the manuscript appropriate for the topic? Please elaborate in the Detailed Comments section.: Satisfactory

8. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript in the Detailed Comments section.: Easy to read


9. Please rate and comment on the timeliness and long term interest of this manuscript to CiSE readers in the Detailed Comments section. Select all that apply.: Topic and content are of immediate and continuing interest to CiSE readers

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice in the Detailed Comments section.: Good

**Date Sent:** 02-Oct-2018

Files attached

[Software sustainability PR, JT.pdf](#)

 Close Window

---

