

Peer Review Bootcamp: What Does It Mean to Be a “good reviewer” for Academic journals?

Submission ID 3003962

Submission Type Workshop

Topic Other

Status Submitted

Submitter MacKenzie Peltier

Affiliation Yale School of Medicine

Participant(s) MacKenzie Peltier (Chairperson), Ismene Petrakis (Co-Chair), Justine Welsh (Co-Chair), Carla Marienfeld (Presenter), Declan Barry (Presenter)

SUBMISSION DETAILS

Workshop Summary Reviewing scientific manuscripts for journals is an important skill that is not often formally taught. The process of reviewing is crucial for the academic process. Journals rely on volunteers to review, and faculty benefit from staying current with new research, ultimately improving the quality of their own scholarly writing. Unfortunately, editorial staff among academic journals, including within the American Journal on Addiction (AJA), the AAP flagship journal, have difficulty finding appropriate colleagues to provide peer-review of academic articles. This negatively impacts the editorial process, increasing the time for editorial decisions and subsequent publication. This workshop is designed to provide participants with an understanding of the editorial process and equip them to feel confident accepting/completing reviews for academic journals, including AJA. For more senior reviewers, the process will provide a framework for mentoring students and trainees to become independent reviewers. Concepts discussed will include guidance on reading a manuscript for peer-review, structuring the written portion of a review, and choosing an editorial recommendation. Discussion incorporated throughout the workshop will include relevant challenges of providing effective peer review, such as conflicts of interest and use of artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted reviews. The didactic portion of the workshop will be augmented by an experiential exercise, in which workshop participants are grouped with a specific editor to practice the skills outlined during the didactic segment.

Workshop Interaction and Engagement Methods Skill-Building Exercises – incorporating tools such as hands-on training, quizzes, toolkits, worksheets, facilitated small group discussions or breakouts., Practical training and problem solving (Role play/Real play) - Presenters or prepared audience members take on various roles to practice techniques/skills.

Interactive Plan Description Following the 45 minute didactic section of the workshop, the workshop participants will be separated into groups that are paired with a specific editor. During this time, each group will be given a section of a manuscript to read and provide initial comments as described in the didactic portion of the workshop. The editor will help guide group discussion and

the use of the presented framework to help the group determine an appropriate editorial recommendation. The groups will be asked to describe several main points that arose during the review of the section of the manuscript in the experiential exercise to the larger group, along with their editorial recommendation.

Writing Educational Learning Objectives

Please list at least three (3) brief learning objectives below.

Learning Objective 1 Describe the peer review process involved in academic journals

Learning Objective 2 Understand how to complete a thorough peer-review of a journal article

Learning Objective 3 Apply learned peer-review skills to a manuscript in real-time