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Introducing our panel guests

‘Editor’: Dr Zijian Zheng
Institute of Textiles and Clothing at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University

‘Reviewer’: Professor Graeme Smith
Professor of Nursing, University of Hong Kong

‘Author’: Dr Shayuti Adnan
School of Business and Maritime Management, University Malaysia Terengganu
Today’s agenda

• introduction to our panelists
• introduction to our ‘better peer review’ work at Wiley
• unwrapping integrity and ethics
• unwrapping fairness and usefulness
• concluding remarks and takeaways
Who is attending our session?

- Publisher
- Funder
- Academic/researcher
- Research Integrity Office
- Communications
- Other
What does ‘good’ peer review look like?
Whatever answer we give…

It must be appropriate for all peer review models

It must be appropriate for all subject areas

It must be appropriate for all geographical regions

It must be appropriate for all business models

It must be appropriate for all sizes and ‘impactfulness’ of journals

It must be appropriate for all who interact with the content
The story so far
Our methodology

Stage 1
- Literature review

Stage 2
- Survey

Stage 3
- Preprint

Stage 4
- Journal article

Stage 5
- Self-assessment
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Stage 2: survey

- Google Form, no restriction
- available to anyone
- advertised via blog post
Our methodology
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Stage 2: survey
Stage 3: preprint
Stage 4: journal article
Stage 5: self-assessment
Stage 3: preprint

https://osf.io/4mfk2/
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Abstract

Aim: To define a set of standards for better peer review. Method: We set out the expectations of five groups of stakeholders in the peer review process: authors, reviewers, editors, readers, and the general public. We then solicited case studies from people involved in peer review, to capture practical insights into how journal teams address the ...
Our methodology

- **Stage 1**: Literature review
- **Stage 2**: Survey
- **Stage 3**: Preprint
- **Stage 4**: Journal article
- **Stage 5**: Self-assessment
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Stage 4: journal article

https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1222

What does better peer review look like? Underlying principles and recommendations for better practice
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Abstract

We conducted a literature review of best practice in peer review. Following this research, we identified five principles for better peer review: Content Integrity, Content Ethics, Fairness, Usefulness, and Timeliness. For each of these principles, we have developed a set of recommendations to improve peer review standards. In this article, we describe the role of peer review and how our five principles support that goal. This article is...
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Stage 5: self-assessment

http://www.wiley.com/go/betterpeerreview

Better Peer Review Self-Assessment (v2.0)

Read me first!

Welcome. This is our Wiley Better Peer Review Self-Assessment. You can use it to reflect on your work with peer reviewers, to reflect on your editorial policies, and to reflect on your work with authors. Your answers will help you identify areas where your practice is great, and areas where you may want to make improvements.

For each pair of questions we'll ask you to rate your practice, first. Then we'll ask you for an all-important narrative description of why you gave yourself that score, which is your opportunity for reflection.

We've noted an “essential area” for each question. This refers to the essential areas for better peer review – namely integrity, ethics, fairness, usefulness, and timeliness – defined in our open access article published in the peer-reviewed journal Learned Publishing https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1222.

When you get to the end, we'll ask you for some feedback, and you'll get to view your own results immediately.

Last, you should soon also be able to get your journal a badge. Our plan is to take your self-assessment, and
Our results

• 40 case studies from survey, from a variety of journals, disciplines, regions and roles

• Five ‘essential areas’ identified, based on literature review and case studies

• Self-assessment responses from 136 journals to date, representing many disciplines
Five ‘essential areas’

- **Integrity**: peer review establishes that the work is reliable and potentially reproducible.
- **Ethics**: peer review establishes that the work was conducted ethically.
- **Fairness**: peer review is objective and impartial.
- **Usefulness**: peer review is constructive and helpful.
- **Timeliness**: peer review provides timely feedback for authors.
Conclusions and next steps

Helping journals to improve their peer review processes:

• equip journal teams to assess how well they currently perform in the five essential areas for better peer review

• encourage journal teams to consider how they can improve in the five essential areas for better peer review
Integrity first, then impact

Our panel

‘Editor’: Dr Zijian Zheng

‘Reviewer’: Professor Graeme Smith

‘Author’: Dr Shayuti Adnan
Integrity and ethics

Peer review establishes that the work is reliable and potentially reproducible.

Peer review establishes that the work was conducted ethically.
Audience poll:

Who has the primary responsibility for safeguarding integrity and ethics in published research?

- Editor
- Reviewer
- Author
Our panel

‘Editor’: Dr Zijian Zheng

‘Reviewer’: Professor Graeme Smith

‘Author’: Dr Shayuti Adnan
Fairness and usefulness

Peer review is objective and impartial.

Peer review is constructive and helpful.
Audience poll:

Has your experience of peer review been that it’s mostly:

• fair
• useful
• fair *and* useful?
• *neither* fair *nor* useful?
Our panel

‘Editor’: Dr Zijian Zheng
‘Reviewer’: Professor Graeme Smith
‘Author’: Dr Shayuti Adnan
What might journals do differently?

Examples from our Wiley colleagues

- Publish a brief description of peer review process on the website
- Give more frequent updates to authors about the status of their manuscript
- Translate instructions to authors in other languages
- Publicly recognise good reviewers
- Give more detailed review feedback to authors about how they can improve their manuscript (even if their manuscript is rejected)
- Solicit reviewers for feedback on the process
- Broaden editorial boards / reviewer panels
Integrity first, then impact

Our website

http://www.wiley.com/go/betterpeerreview

Introducing the Better Peer Review Self-Assessment

The Better Peer Review Self-Assessment is designed for you if you’re a member of a journal team. It focuses on how you deliver your research publishing service to researchers, and on five essential areas of practice: Integrity, ethics, fairness, usefulness, and timelines. (You can read more about our essential areas in our peer reviewed, open access article [here](#)).

The Better Peer Review Self-Assessment is a service for you and your team members so you can reflect on your entire peer review publishing process, including and extending beyond the act of peer review itself.

The Better Peer Review Self-Assessment gives you feedback. That feedback helps you and your team to contextualize your evaluation of your own practices with those from your peers in other journal teams.

The Better Peer Review Self-Assessment helps you to identify and celebrate where you are doing brilliantly. It offers you advice on how you might consider making improvements when you decide they will be beneficial.

What do we have to do now, to get started?

Just send us an email. We’ll share a link that will take you directly to the self-assessment. Please, email Elisha Morris and the Better Peer Review team at [betterpeerreview@wiley.com](mailto:betterpeerreview@wiley.com) now, and we’ll be in touch directly. More information to help you understand what it’s all about is below.
Thank you for listening and contributing!

(and please send us your feedback)

emoylan@wiley.com
miwillis@wiley.com