

Managing the academic peer review process 2023/2024

Course information

The course offers a step-by-step guide for PhD candidates to navigate the publication process of peer-reviewed journals. After following the course, you should be able to effectively

- 1.) write a cover letter.
- 2.) write a rebuttal letter.
- 3.) understand the role, incentives and expectations of the editor.
- 4.) understand the role, incentives and expectations of the reviewer.
- 5.) assess whether your manuscript truly fits your intended journal.

Also, the course includes practical tips and tricks in order to help you to optimally plan your actions both during the writing and submission phase. Finally, the course includes a Q&A with Steven Flipse, who is an assistant professor at TU Delft as well as a seasoned editor, reviewer and promotor.

The course day consists of short lectures and (individual and collective) exercises. Throughout the course day the you are stimulated to contribute to discussions and exchange experiences with your peers.

Target group:

Please know that this course is designed for 2nd and 3rd year PhD candidates, as is communicated by Graduate School. If you are in your 1st or 4th year you still are more than welcome to join in. However, do keep in mind that the course might not cater to your immediate academic needs.

To “bring”:

Please make sure to bring a draft of a paper you are currently working on. **You will need one in order to complete the course.** Preferably, your draft has somewhat of a structure. The actual text does not have to be at a final stage per se.

Mandatory intake assignments

Prior to the plenary session there are a number of intake assignments to complete (individually).

- Assignment 0: Share a brief bio that includes your name, research topic(s) and what year of the PhD you are currently in.
- Assignment 1: Discuss your prior knowledge and experiences regarding paper submission and the peer review processes (max. 250 words). If possible, elaborate on challenges you have encountered and how you have handled them (or have attempted to handle them).
- Assignment 2: Define at least 3 personal learning goals you would like to work on during this course. For inspiration, feel free to use the action verbs described in [Bloom's taxonomy](#).
- Assignment 3: Watch the following clip: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWzKI4WhSPQ>
- Assignment 4: Read the e-book 'Research impact: A guide to creating, capturing, and evaluating the impact of your research', in order to gain a broad(er) perspective on research impact in contemporary science of which the academic peer review process is a part of.

Mandatory post-class assignments

A week after the plenary session all participants will need to complete the following assignments.

- Assignment 5: Write a “journal submission plan” in which you discuss topics such as journal choice, planning, internal reviews. Also, elaborate on relevant edits (to be) made and why they matter for a successful submission. For this plan, select at least 3 possible journals / conferences that you would consider relevant to your work and elaborate on why you think this is the case. Also select one journal

that you would prefer to publish in and elaborate on the steps you will take to (1) connect to recent topics in that journal, (2) identify possible reviewers, and (3) identify (recent) work of the editors of this journal.

- Assignment 6: Write a reflection on your personal learning goals. To what extent were they achieved? Are there any new or more refined learning goals regarding peer review processes? If so, what is your plan in achieving these goals?

About the instructor

Robert Pronk has an academic background in both medical engineering and socio-technical integration research. He has been involved as a consultant and freelance researcher, conducting Health Technology Assessments, Life Cycle Assessments and patient pathway analysis in both academic and commercial settings in the field of sustainable medical technology.