

An Overview Into Peer Review Process

Author

Enago Academy

Post Url

<https://www.enago.com/academy/an-overview-into-peer-review/>



Peer review is the most sought after process in the publishing industry. Getting your work validated from the experts in your field enhances the quality of your work. The originality of articles for publication along with validity and quality of the research work is usually assessed during the peer review process. The most crucial function of peer review is to uphold the integrity of science while filtering out invalid or weak quality articles. This infographic provides an overview of peer review and makes it easier for the researcher to understand the complicated process of peer review.

An Overview into Peer Review Process

Peer review process assesses the validity, quality, and originality of articles for publication.

The ultimate goal is to maintain the integrity of research.

Peer review process functions as a filter for content.

It directs quality articles to quality journals and thus creates journal brands.

Peer review process adds value to articles.

The three most common types of peer review are:

Single blind

Author does not know the identity of the reviewers.

Double blind

Author does not know the identity of the reviewers and vice-versa.

Open Review

The identity of the author and the reviewers are known by all participants.

The newer evolved models which include key variations from the standard approach include:

Transferable

New form of peer review, allows subject-related journals to transfer reviewed manuscripts between each other.

Collaborative

Broad variety of approach where a team of people work together to undertake the review.

Post publication

Appraisal and revision of a paper continues - or occurs - after publication.

Method

Advantage

Disadvantage

Single blind peer review process



Article is criticised without fear of being pressured or challenged.

Author identity provides context to the research subject and equips reviewer with more information to assess the submitted paper.



Objectivity may be lost.

The reviewer may judge the paper instead of judging the paper resulting in personal bias.

Gender and Regional bias might interfere with the judgement

Double blind peer review process



Bias and other discrimination based on author's background is considerably reduced.

The author or reviewer are not subjected to personal negative attacks or pressure.



Knowing the author's research background may be beneficial for the research review.

The reviewers can guess the authors identity based on the research topic, writing style, etc.

Open peer review process



Manipulation and bias is reduced due to transparent practices.



To avoid any conflict of interest from authors, reviewers may curb from providing a desired response or refrain from giving a strong negative critique.

Hybrid peer review process



Reduced manipulation and bias.

Reviewers provide in depth comments and interact with authors over an extended period of time.

Publication priority can be claimed on the first day of open discussion.

Rejection rates drastically decrease as authors carefully decide whether their research is complete and their methods are adequate before submitting manuscripts.

This method may bring about unavoidable and difficult questions in front of the reviewers.



Organisations Supporting Peer Review

- ▶ Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) www.publicationethics.org
- ▶ World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) www.wame.org
- ▶ Society for Scholarly Publishing (SSP) www.sspnet.org
- ▶ International Publishers' Association (IPA) www.internationalpublishers.org
- ▶ International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM) www.stm-assoc.org

Visit www.enago.com for scientific and academic editing services. Enago helps researchers to get published in high-impact factor journals globally.

Cite this article

Enago Academy, An Overview Into Peer Review Process. Enago Academy. 2019/05/30. <https://www.enago.com/academy/an-overview-into-peer-review/>