

Appendix: Selected Literature and Links

This appendix contains a collection of links and references to publications that are related to (the practical aspects of) peer reviewing. Many references come from the medical domain, but the general principles also apply for computer science. In fact, there seems to exist an overall shared and agreed-upon idea of what good peer reviewing should consist of.

All the links have been checked and accessed on 21 July 2015. It was not the intention to be exhaustive. A standard Internet search led to an initial list of texts which were kept if they showed some practical usefulness for starting reviewers. The bibliographies in this “seed list” were examined to collect additional articles that deal with peer reviewing in practice.

Some Papers on Reviewing in General

- __, (2015), Scholarly Communication and Peer review—the current landscape and future trends, The Wellcome Trust, http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/stellent/groups/corporatesite/@policy_communications/documents/web_document/wtp059003.pdf
- __, COST Action TD1306 New Frontiers of Peer Reviewing, <http://www.peere.org/>
- __, The Springer page on Publishing Ethics for Journals: A guide for Editors-in-Chief, Associate Editors, and Managing Editors, <https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/editors/publishing-ethics-for-journals/4176>
- Dale Benos, Edlira Bashari, Jose Chaves et al. (2007) The Ups and Downs of Peer Review, *Advances in Physiology Education* 31: 145–152, <http://>

depts.washington.edu/uwbri/PDF%20Files/Benosetal2007_AdvPhysiolEduc%7BUpsDownsofPR%7D.pdf

- LiquidPub Consortium (2009) Analysis of Reviews and Modelling of Reviewer Behaviour and Peer Review, in deliverable D.1.1 “State of the Art”, pp. 29-58, http://disi.unitn.it/~birukou/publications/papers/2009LP_D1.1.pdf
- A. Mulligan, L. Hall, E. Raphael (2013) Peer Review in a Changing world: an International Study Measuring the Attitudes of Researchers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 64: 132–161. Full report: Sense about Science Peer Review Survey 2009: <http://www.senseaboutscience.org/pages/peer-review-survey-2009.html>
- Azzurra Ragone, Katsiaryna Mirylenka, Fabio Casati, Maurizio Marchese (2013) On Peer Review in Computer Science: Analysis of its Effectiveness and Suggestions for Improvement. *Scientometrics* 97: 317–356, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11192-013-1002-z>
- Drummond Rennie (2003) Editorial Peer Review: its Development and Rationale. In: Fiona Godlee, Tom Jefferson (eds) *Peer Review in Health Sciences*, 2nd edn. BMJ Books, London, pp. 1–13 http://www.culik.com/1190fall2012/Paper_1_files/rennie.pdf
- Robert S. Turner (2009) Independent Peer Review Helps Assure Quality, Value, Objectivity. *Journal of the National Grants Management Association* 17: 43–48, <http://projects.ecr.gov/moriversciencepanel/pdfs%5CBestPracticesPeerReview.pdf>
- Richard Walker, Pascal Rocha da Silva (2015) Emerging Trends in Peer Review—a Survey. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 9:169, <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2015.00169/full>
- J. Wilson (ed) (2012) *Peer review: The Nuts and Bolts*. Standing up for Science 3, Sense about Science, London, <http://www.senseaboutscience.org/pages/peer-review-the-nuts-and-bolts.html>

Some Guidelines for Reviewers with Practical Suggestions

- Dale Benos, Kevin Kirk, John Hall (2003) How to Review a Paper. *Advances in Physiology Education* 27: 47–52, <http://advan.physiology.org/content/27/2/47.long>
- COPE (2013) Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers, <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>

- Council of Science Editors (2012) Reviewer Roles and Responsibilities, <http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-3-reviewer-roles-and-responsibilities/>
- Frederic Hoppin Jr. (2002) How I Review an Original Scientific Article. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 166: 1019–1023, <http://www.atsjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1164/rccm.200204-324OE>
- Brian Johnson (2015) Across the Desk: An Editor’s Guide to Peer review Best Practice. <http://exchanges.wiley.com/blog/2015/02/12/across-the-desk-an-editors-guide-to-peer-review-best-practice/>
- Melina R. Kibbe (eds) A Primer for How to Peer Review a Manuscript for JSR, <http://www.journalofsurgicalresearch.com/pb/assets/raw/Health%20Advance/journals/yjsre/JSR-Primer.pdf>
- Chris MacQuarie (2012) Dear Buggy/Cher Bibitte. *Bulletin of the Entomological Society of Canada*, 44: 28–32, http://esc-sec.ca/bulletin/Bulletin_Mar_2012.pdf
- David Moher, Alejandro R. Jadad (2003) How to Peer Review a Manuscript. In: Tom Jefferson, *Peer Review in Health Sciences*, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 183–190 <http://www.bmj.com/sites/default/files/attachments/resources/2011/07/moher.pdf>
- Nayera Moftah (2009) Reviewing Scientific Articles. *The Journal of The Egyptian Women’s Dermatologic Society* 6: 3–8, http://www.jewds.eg.net/pdf/vol_6_1/2.pdf
- Kimberly Nicholas, Wendy Gordon (2011) A Quick Guide to Writing a Solid Peer Review. In: EOS, *Transactions American Geophysical Union* 92: 233–234, http://publications.agu.org/files/2012/12/PeerReview_Guide.pdf
- Ian Parberry (1989) A Guide for New Referees. *Theoretical Computer Science, Information and Computing* 112: 96–116, http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0890540184710534/1-s2.0-S0890540184710534-main.pdf?_tid=56c4b910-28b1-11e5-81de-00000aacb35d&acdnat=1436717963_4ebf39b14aa9a10a8bb767106e7d3dea
- Jigisha Patel (2015) A Beginner’s Guide to Peer Review: Part Two, <http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2015/06/08/beginners-guide-peer-review-part-two/>
- James Provenzale, Robert Stanley (2006) A Systematic Guide to Reviewing a Manuscript. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine Technology* 34: 92–99, <http://tech.snmjournals.org/content/34/2/92.full>
- Jennifer Raff (2013) How to Become Good at Peer Review: A guide for Young Scientists, <http://violentmetaphors.com/2013/12/13/how-to-become-good-at-peer-review-a-guide-for-young-scientists/>

- Jay Rojewski, Desirae Domenicon (2004) The Art and Politics of Peer Review. *Journal of Career and Technical Education* 20: 41–54, <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JCTE/v20n2/pdf/rojewski.pdf>
- Alan Jay Smith (1990) The Task of a Referee, http://www-sop.inria.fr/members/Arnaud.Legout/Documents/external_reviewing.html
- Britta Teller (2014) Peer Review, <https://brittinator.wordpress.com/2014/10/17/peer-review/>
- J. Winck, J. Fonseca, L. Azevedo, J. Wedzicha (2011) To Publish or Perish: How to Review a Manuscript. *Revista Portuguesa de Pneumologia* 17: 96–103, <http://www.elsevier.pt/en/revistas/revista-portuguesa-pneumologia-320/artigo/to-publish-or-perish-how-to-review-manuscript-90002033>

An additional reviewing guidelines paper, but seen from the opposite view (what not to do) and written in a humoristic style.

- Graham Cormode (2008) How NOT to review a paper. The tools and techniques of the adversarial reviewer. *SIGMOD Record* 37: 100-104, <http://www.sigmod.org/publications/sigmod-record/0812/p100.open.cormode.pdf>

Albeit in a medical context, this paper reports on a tutorial on peer reviewing for undergraduate students.

- P. Rangachari (2010) Teaching undergraduates the process of peer review: learning by doing. *Advances in Physiology Education* 34: 137–144, <http://advan.physiology.org/content/ajpadvan/34/3/137.full.pdf>

Papers That Discuss Possible Future Trends in Peer Reviewing

- Richard P. Gabriel (2002) *Writers' Workshops & The Work of Making Things*. Addison Wesley Longman, New York, <https://www.dreamsongs.com/Files/WritersWorkshop.pdf> (prepublication version)
- Neil B. Harrison (1999) The Language of Shepherding. A Pattern Language for Shepherds and Sheep. In: *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Pattern Languages of Programs (PLoP 1999)*, http://www.europlop.net/sites/default/files/files/3_TheLanguageOfShepherding1.pdf
- Nikolaus Kriegeskorte, Diana Deca (eds) (2012) Beyond open access: visions for open evaluation of scientific papers by post-publication peer review, <http://journal.frontiersin.org/researchtopic/beyond-open-access->

[visions-for-open-evaluation-of-scientific-papers-by-post-publication-peer-review-137#articles](#)

- Nikolaus Kriegeskorte, Alexander Walther, Diana Deca (2012) An emerging consensus for open evaluation: 18 visions for the future of scientific publishing. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fncom.2012.00094/full>

The following paper is interesting to see how the then future vision in 1999 has evolved in 2014 as in 1999 social media and related technologies still were at the very beginning of their later widespread adoption.

- Richard Smith (2003) The future of peer review. In: *Peer Review in Health Sciences*. Fiona Godlee, Tom Jefferson (eds), 2nd edn. BMJ Books, London, pp. 329–346, <http://www.bmj.com/sites/default/files/attachments/resources/2011/07/smith.pdf>

Examples of Bad Practice

An entertaining topic is that of (semi-) automatically generated bogus papers that have been submitted (and accepted!) after a so-called serious reviewing process:

- <http://www.nature.com/news/publishers-withdraw-more-than-120-gibberish-papers-1.14763>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sokal_affair
- <http://marginalrevolution.com/marginalrevolution/2012/10/nonsense-paper-accepted-by-mathematics-journal.html>
- <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/shortcuts/2014/feb/26/how-computer-generated-fake-papers-flooding-academia>
- <http://smritiweb.com/navin/education-2/how-i-published-a-fake-paper-and-why-it-is-the-fault-of-our-education-system>
- <http://retractionwatch.com/2013/10/03/science-reporter-spoofs-hundreds-of-journals-with-a-fake-paper>
- <http://retractionwatch.com/2012/09/17/retraction-count-for-scientist-who-faked-emails-to-do-his-own-peer-review-grows-to-35/#more-9761>