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What is peer review?

• Evaluation of work by one or more people of similar competence to the producers of the work (peers).
  – A form of self-regulation by qualified members of a profession within the relevant field.
  – The only widely accepted method for research validation
  – Uphold the quality and validity of individual articles and journals that publish them
Most scientists regarded the new streamlined peer-review process as ‘quite an improvement.’
Why being a reviewer?

• Reviewing requires
  – Investment of time
  – Skillset
Why get involved in peer review?

- Personally an honor
- Establish your expertise in the field and expand your knowledge
- Improve your reputation and increase your exposure to key figures in the field
- Develop critical thinking skills essential to research
- Stay up to date with the latest literature
- Advanced in your career: peer review is an essential role for researchers

- Publishers are now thinking “Reward” reviewers for the work they do
Experience of peer review

- For example, “more than 100 peer reviews of articles in relevant fields”
  - Of definite benefit to you
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Objective:
Collect and publicly display reviewer activities, introduce statuses, and provide perks related to important contribution of reviewers

Advisors:
Prof. Dr. Lutz Prechelt
Dr. Simon Gosling

Current status:
• +600 journals across all PMGs, +300,000 Reviewer Profile page
• Recognized Reviewer
• Outstanding Reviewer
• Certificate of Excellence: editor’s choice
Peer Review reports as articles

- 27% authors, 45% reviewers say they got new insights
- No influenced on evaluation
- No influenced on writing report
How can I become a reviewer?

• Typically reviewers are invited by a journal editor
• Select researchers that are experts in the same subject area as the paper
• But, you can always contact one of the journal’s editors
• Identify which journal you would like to review
• Visit the journal homepage and view full editorial board
• Contact the relevant editors through the site and offer your reviewing services
Dear Dr.,

Thank you for your contact. In due course, you will be requested to review adequate manuscript. Thanks again.

Cheers!

Editorial Office
Journal of Gynecologic Oncology

www.ejgo.org

On Feb 4, 2016, at 4:07 PM, I wrote:

Hello, I am writing this letter to request an opportunity in reviewing articles connecting with the journal. In my reference I am and currently working as an Associate Research Scientist at MD Anderson Cancer Center. I have contributed in more than 15 Research articles from one of the top Science Journals such as Cell, Nature, Science. In the past I have had an opportunity to work for top companies and institutes like Amgen, and Harvard Medical. I have also worked for a very important project called TCGA which was funded by US Government NCI and Md andersons Moonshot. I am currently reviewing research manuscripts for Nature and i am also on reviewer and editorial board of PLOS Genetics,Journal of Cancer Prevention & Current Research, New England Journal of Medicine Journal of the National Cancer Institute and other journals.

I am attaching my resume to this email. It will be my pleasure to provide my contribution to the Journal in best possible way. Below is the link to show the research papers i am involved in are cited 2414 times by researchers all over the world.

https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=dIJMh8cAAAAJ&hl=enW

Sincere Regards,
JGO reviewer application form

• Download at ejgo.org
What Makes a Good Reviewer?

- Spending longer than 3 hours on a review on average did not appear to increase review quality as rated by editors and authors.
• Don’t rush to accept an invitation to peer review a manuscript
  – Familiar enough with the content area or the method
  – Conflict of interest
  – Enough time to review
Systematic process to review the manuscript

1) Scientific originality
2) Its strength and weakness (content, methodological, ethical)
3) The presentation/clarity of the paper
4) The interpretation of results
5) Future direction
6) Suitability for publication
Checklist for review

- Title
- Abstract
- Introduction: specific
- Methods: reproducible
- Results: consistent and reasonable
- Discussion: logical, condense and focused
- Conclusion: no broader interpretation
- References: compatible with journal style
- Table and figure: independent as it is
- Final decision:
  - do not make mixed-signal review
Rating

• Confidential comments to the EIC, including
  – Plagiarism, fraud or any other ethical concerns

• Comments to the authors
  – Overall
    • Summarize the article in a short paragraph
    • Give your main impressions, including
      – Whether it is novel and interesting
      – Whether it has a sufficient impact and adds to the knowledge base
    • Point out any journal-specific points—does it adhere to the journal’s standards?
  – Specific
    • From title to reference
    • layout and format: adequate, inadequate, or not applicable
**Recommendation**

Accept  
Minor Revision  
**Major Revision**  
Reject

**Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

**Confidential Comments to the EIC**

There are tons of redundancies and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. The structure is too weak and incoherent to understand the main idea the author mean to convey. Furthermore, the author didn't correct all the points that I mentioned earlier in previous version of revision.

**Comments to the Author**

1. You should follow the instructions for authors. Table footnotes should be indicated with superscript symbols in sequence suggested in the instructions.  
   Chi-square test, not Qui-squares.  
   In table 1, '=' should be contained in either <50 or >50.  
   Title of table 2 does not make sense at all. It should be corrected.  
   Every table should have the same format, for example, 'n' and '%' in table 3 should be moved to upper line.  
   In figure 1, you indicated the magnification is 400x in all images. However, all the images in figure 1 do not seem to have the same magnification. You should confirm it.

2. I cannot understand the line 96.
   3. You should give a brief explanation of the IHC validated protocol in your methods.  
   4. The sentences from line 151 to 154 should be rewritten. For example, "1<10% of stained nuclei" could be just simply "1-10%".  
   5. no significant difference, not significant imbalance.  
   6. In discussion, you should suggest presumptive mechanisms underlying any reported prognostic impact of the ER/PR expression levels.  
   7. In the second paragraph of page 10, you should give examples of previous studies.  
   8. The sentence of line 257-258 should be removed because it does not have something to do with other sentences.
This manuscript is very interesting. Although this paper has minor concerns about the methodology, the manuscript is well written and well presented.

Although this manuscript has several limitation including a referral bias, it deserves publication because the rarity of GTN following partial molar pregnancy.

Although the purpose of this study seemed to be clinically important, the authors drew improper conclusion from the inappropriate sample. Also, the methodology was very poor and not scientific.

Although the method and result section appear to be reasonable and scientific, the authors jumped into the conclusion. Also, the main results was already well-known.
Summary

• **Authors and reviewer: interchangeable roles**
  – as reviewer, researchers ‘repay’ the same courtesy they receive as authors
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The 4th International Workshop on Gynecologic Oncology

Date: Nov. 12 (Sat) – 13 (Sun), 2016
Venue: Sendai International Center
President: Nobuo Yaegashi, M.D., PhD. Professor, Tohoku University

http://jsgos39.umin.jp
The 5th Biennial Meeting of Asian Society of Gynecologic Oncology

[Date] Nov 30 (Thr) – Dec 2 (Sat), 2017
[Venue] Sankei-plaza, Tokyo, Japan
[President] Daisuke Aoki, M.D., PhD.
Professor, Keio University