

How to Communicate in the Peer Review Process

A Gentle Guideline for Novice Researchers

Jong In Lim, Sungbin Youk, and Hee Sun Park*

School of Media and Communication, Korea University

Abstract

The main purpose of this essay is to encourage novice scholars to participate in the peer review process. This essay discusses how to communicate during the process as a reviewer and an author. When evaluating a manuscript as a reviewer, the scholar needs to show respect to the authors, be cooperative with other members of the review team, and be timely with completing the review. The reviewer needs to also communicate with the editors regarding any concerns or problems in evaluating the submitted manuscript. More importantly, a reviewer needs to be consistent in the tone and the content of the evaluation when communicating with either the editor or the author. As an author, knowing the expectations of the editors, adhering to the submission guidelines, not taking rejections personally, and being reasonably flexible in adhering to the reviewer's comments are some of the communicative strategies a scholar needs to bear in mind during the review process. Consequently, the peer review process will benefit from having scholars who use these communicative strategies.

Keywords: communication, peer review process, publication guideline, novice researchers

*Corresponding author: heesunpark@korea.ac.kr

Although the definition and purpose of a peer review system may vary in different places, we as the authors of this essay consider it to be a communicative procedure between the authors, reviewers, and editors (Shim, 2018). Consistent with our view, Loonen, Hage, and Kon (2005) stated that these three parties communicate about the submitted manuscript during the peer review process. In this process, they discuss the academic value of the manuscript as well as whether it is worthy of publication. The peer review may help the authors to improve their manuscripts as well as the editors to find quality research papers that the journal merits from publishing.

Although it is rather obvious that the authors and the editors benefit from the peer review system, scholars may be reluctant to take part in the process as reviewers (Northcraft & Tenbrunsel, 2011). This is because scholars tend to regard reviewing as a burdening task which requires time and intellectual labor (Tite & Schroter, 2007). Consequently, the editors may have a hard time finding scholars who are willing to devote their time and effort to review another scholar's manuscript. Because the peer review system relies heavily on the scholars' voluntary contributions (Curtin, Russial, & Tefertiller, 2018; Treviño, 2008), this tendency to avoid will, unfortunately, create a vicious cycle. As fewer scholars take part in the review process, the role becomes more burdensome for those who volunteered, which may tempt them to opt-out.

We aim to provide a counter-argument to the notion that the costs of reviewing outweigh its rewards. To end the vicious cycle, this essay advocates collaborative communication between the editors, the reviewers, and the authors. It should be noted that the novice scholars, such as those in their master's or Ph.D. programs, are our target audiences. This is because they are either the prospective or the active interlocutors of the review

process. Furthermore, there is an insufficient number of graduate-level seminars or lectures on becoming a reviewer compared to other content classes (Sullivan, Crocitto, & Carraher, 2006). Therefore, the scholars who are already familiar with the peer review process may find the contents of this essay to be banal. Nonetheless, novice scholars may merit from the concise summary and guidelines provided in this essay. We first start by giving a brief overview of the peer review process. Second, the essay discusses how to communicate with the editors and authors as a reviewer and the consequential benefits of doing so. Having the scholars to participate in the review process will help them to draft a constructive manuscript and the academia to enjoy a proliferation of quality papers. Third, we share some pointers in submitting a manuscript as an author. The suggestion helps the readers to understand what the reviewers expect from a submitted document. Last, along with a summary of how to communicate during the review process, this essay concludes with some practical suggestions to facilitate the peer review system.

A Brief Account of the Review Process

The scholars who just started to ignite their academic ambition may not be familiar with the review process. Therefore, we briefly summarize each step of the review process. To get started, a scholar needs to conduct research, write a manuscript, and submit it to a journal. The submitted manuscript will then undergo the following series of reviews.

First, the editor-in-chief or the assistant editor (hereinafter referred to as editors for the sake of convenience) initially decides whether the manuscript meets the standard of the journal or not

(Billsberry, 2014; Froese & Bader, 2019). This stage is commonly named as the desk review. When rejected at this step or the desk rejects, the editor returns the manuscript to the authors without it being examined by a review team. According to Billsberry (2014), the editor rejects a manuscript which is inconsistent with the journal's domain, has insufficient contributions to the field, and excessive in its length. Hence, the authors need to closely read the submission guidelines and previously published articles in the journal to prevent desk rejections as it is a relatively easy hurdle to overcome compared to the other steps of the review process.

Second, after passing the desk review, the editor invites scholars who are experts in the topic or the method of the manuscript to the review process (Beyer, Chanove, & Fox, 1995). Once the reviewers accept their invitation, they are given around two to four weeks to evaluate the submitted manuscript. The review team may consist of scholars from the editorial board and/or researchers invited as ad-hoc or guest reviewers.

Third, after compiling the reviewer's comments, the editor makes the editorial decision (Ward, Graber, & van der Mars, 2015). The editor can either reject, ask for revise and resubmit, or accept the manuscript. As Conn (2014) suggested, rejection is not a reason to discard your manuscript. Scholars may benefit from reflecting on the given feedback, improving the manuscript, and asking for reevaluation from the same journal. When given revise and resubmit, scholars often resubmit to the journal after a thorough revision instead of sending the unrevised manuscript to another journal (Altman & Baruch, 2008). This may be because the evaluation of revise and resubmit indicates that the reviewers thought the manuscript had the potential for future publication in the submitted journal (Walsh, 2014). The authors of the manuscript should respond to the invitation of the revision by addressing every concern of the reviewers (Shaw, 2012). They can

either improve their original submission based on the reviewers' concerns or explicitly explain why certain revisions are unnecessary. Although it is less likely, a manuscript may be accepted as it is. In the next step, the manuscript is accepted by a journal and is ready to be published.

The overall steps provide a stepping stone for the less-experienced researchers, such as the first-year doctoral students, helping them to grasp the gist of the peer review process. To fully understand the process, they can take various roles, such as that of the reviewer and the author (Corley & Schinoff, 2017). The following sections explicate how to communicate with other parties in the review process as reviewers and authors, which can consequently help the scholars to maximize the benefit of partaking in this process.

Communicating as a Reviewer

In the beginning stage of an academic career, seizing the opportunities to be a reviewer can be a powerful strategy for the researchers. The novice scholars can both indirectly and directly experience what it is like to be a reviewer. In terms of the former, reading essays like this or editorials on the importance of the peer review system is a good place to start. Opening the ears to other scholars with more experience in publishing manuscripts and sharing information among the less experienced researchers are two simple yet useful ways to get a better sense of the review process. Regarding the direct experiences, there are opportunities for graduate students to experience becoming a reviewer. For example, an ample amount of conference divisions welcome scholars and researchers in various career-levels to take part in reviewing the conference papers. In order to further enhance

their experience as reviewers, we will elaborate on the dos and don'ts of being a reviewer. This section ends by discussing the benefits of such experiences.

What to do as a reviewer

Providing a summary, mentioning the academic value, and pointing out the fatal flaws of a manuscript are important components of a reviewer's comment (Sullivan, Crocitto, & Carraher, 2006). However, we are here to discuss what we consider to be the pivotal attitudes reviewers must bear in mind when communicating with the editors and the authors: being respectful, cooperative, and diligent.

To be a respectful reviewer, scholars need to consider themselves as a coach when evaluating a manuscript. We use the term coach to prevent the reviewers from considering themselves as an n^{th} coauthor. Taylor (2003) stated that reviewers should think of themselves as coauthors in order to give constructive comments. We agree with Taylor regarding the importance of giving constructive feedback. However, the term coach is more suitable than coauthors. This is because the reviewers should not force the authors to produce a manuscript that they want to see or would have written if they had conducted the research (Lepak, 2009). The reviewers ought to recommend possible amendments instead of fixing the shortcomings on behalf of the authors (Shugan, 2007).

While coaching the manuscript, the reviewer should focus on providing constructive feedback and unbiased evaluation. According to Lepak (2009), reviewers should refrain from focusing solely on the weakness and fatal flaws of the manuscript. This indicates that the reviewers' comments should be constructive and actionable recommendations, which authors

can follow to resolve the problems in their manuscript (Davison, de Vreede, & Briggs, 2005; Ward et al., 2015). For example, a respectful reviewer may suggest the authors to reorganize the introduction in a way that accentuates the research question and the academic contribution of the manuscript (Taylor, 2003). In addition, a constructive comment focuses on strengthening the connection between the theoretical foundation and the methodology of the manuscript (Bakanic, McPhail, & Simon, 1989; Shapiro & Sitkin, 2006). Consequently, a constructive review can coach the authors to improve the clarity of the manuscript.

Whilst giving constructive comments, the reviewers must be impartial in their evaluation. For instance, the reviewers should not favor certain types of methodology, research design, paradigms, and topics (Sullivan et al., 2006; Ward et al., 2015). More importantly, it is strongly recommended for reviewers to refrain from being biased against nonsignificant results. According to Beyer et al. (1995), a manuscript rejected by the reviewer for having nonsignificant findings is likely to be rejected by the editors as well. However, the absence of an asterisk (*), which often denotes a statistically significant result, is noteworthy when research is well designed. For instance, a manuscript that reports a test of a theory with a rigorous experiment may have nonsignificant findings, which imply the inconsistency between the data and the hypotheses according to the theory. In this case, the statistically nonsignificant results are theoretically important because those results may challenge the theory. In addition, the prejudice against nonsignificant findings may inflate the perceived replicability of research. Concerns regarding file drawer problem and publication bias are not new (see Sterling, 1959). These occur when manuscripts with significant findings get published, while those without are

metaphorically kept in the researcher's personal drawer and are not available to the public (Scargle, 2000). Therefore, other scholars expect their research also to find significant results as an ample proportion of previous research had statistically significant findings. To be an unbiased evaluator, it is recommended for a reviewer to give logical arguments that are backed with clear evidence when making statements that may convey partisanship. After all, being a fair reviewer is critical because "[reviewers] can and do put academic lives in peril whenever [their] reviews are less than completely fair" (Shapiro & Sitkin, 2006, p.79).

To be a cooperative reviewer, the scholar should work with, not against, the authors, other reviewers, and the editors (Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2009). To build a collaborative relationship with the authors, the reviewers should focus on the evidence and findings of the research (Shugan, 2007). The reviewer needs to refrain from evaluating the manuscript based on presumptions and predictions about the research, instead of what is stated in the manuscript. By providing a constructive and reasonable review, authors can perceive the reviewers to be reliable and trustworthy, which makes them more likely to be open to revising their manuscripts as suggested (Sullivan et al., 2006). Furthermore, the reviewer impairs their relationship with the author and delays the review process when inconsistent and different requests are made in each revise and resubmit. Even when the reviewer decides to reject the paper, they can help the authors by suggesting not only ways to improve the manuscript but also alternative outlets that can merit from publishing the manuscript (Sullivan et al., 2006). In terms of working with other scholars as a single review team, a reviewer should acknowledge that other reviewers may have different opinions. Thus, it is possible for reviewers to offer conflicting suggestions, to which the editor makes a final decision (e.g., Glidewell, 1988)

Even if the editorial decision is inconsistent with the reviewer's recommendation, the reviewer should respect it. This is because the primary role of the reviewer is to help the editor make a decision about the submitted manuscript. In terms of the relationship between the reviewer and the editor, it is recommended for the reviewer to build a sense of trust. It is important for the potential reviewers to be honest with their academic abilities with the editors. For example, when reviewers are dubious of their own competence in evaluating specific manuscripts, they should contact the editors as soon as possible (Ward et al., 2015). This example may make novice scholars anxious. However, the reviewers need to trust the editor's judgment even if they are unfamiliar with the research topic (Sullivan et al., 2006). They may have been chosen for their expertise in the research methods or procedure (Shugan, 2007). It should be noted that it is unlikely for a reviewer to be a perfect match in terms of both the content and the method of the manuscript (Ward et al., 2015).

Diligence is a virtue of being a reviewer. Especially, timeliness is pivotal in a review process (Lepak, 2009). The entire process may be delayed by the reviewers if they continuously ask for revise and resubmit (Shugan, 2007), opt-out from reviewing at the last minute (Sullivan et al., 2006), or simply miss the deadline of their evaluation (Shapiro & Sitkin, 2006). According to Shugan (2007), the probability of two reviewers completing their assessment in time is 49%. When there are more reviewers, the probability drops. A late review may be burdensome for scholars who are on or pursuing a tenure track (Shapiro & Sitkin, 2006). This is because publishing a manuscript affects the scholar's employment status and salary (Dusansky & Vernon, 1998; Graves, Marchand, & Thompson, 1982; Raelin, 2008; Sauer, 1988; Tuckman & Leahey, 1975).

Because reviewing is voluntary and service to the profession, editors have a hard time enforcing the deadline on the reviewers (Shapiro & Sitkin, 2006). For that reason, possible reviewers should respond quickly even if they are declining the offer (Carpenter, 2009). They need to devote a sufficient amount of time to thoroughly evaluate the submission. It is recommended for the reviewers to wait a few days to re-read their reviews and the manuscript before pressing the send button (Schepmyer, van Emmerick, & Olive, 2006). A prompt review, as well as writing a constructive review and working as a team player in this process, enables the reviewer to build a trusting relationship with the editor.

What not to do as a reviewer

It is needless to say that reviewers must avoid being disrespectful, uncooperative, and lazy. In addition, the novice scholars need to put in the effort to prevent themselves from sending ambiguous and equivocal evaluations when communicating with the editors or the authors. The reviewers are often given a separate space where they can communicate solely and confidentially with the editors when submitting their reviews (Ward et al., 2015). In the confidential comments to the editors, the reviewers can elaborate on their comments and explain their decisions to the editors. The reviewers tend to be blunt in this section while remaining more diplomatic and implicit to the authors (Bakanic et al., 1989). However, the respective voice and sentiment should be consistent when communicating with either the editors or the authors (Ward et al., 2015). For instance, the reviewer should not write a positive review and discuss several reasons for rejecting the manuscript only with the editor. This is because the editors have difficulty comprehending the reviewer's decision when an

inconsistent tone is used in their comments to the author (Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2009).

When the reviewers communicate with the authors, their review of the manuscript should clearly reflect their recommended editorial decision. For example, the reviewer should not list a series of compliments and/or a handful of minor flaws in their comments to the authors when deciding to reject the manuscript. Furthermore, the reviewer should refrain from giving false hope to the authors (Shugan, 2007). Sullivan and colleagues (2006) argued that rejecting a paper is more beneficial for the author, editor, and fellow reviewers than coercing a lengthy process of revise and resubmit for the manuscript with a low chance of publication even after the revision.

Although a blatant negative review is lesser of the evil than a false positive review, the delivery of the review can still be courteous regardless of its content. A reviewer may tend to write negative reviews because their education and training in the doctoral program encouraged them to find flaws even in the most esteemed research articles (Shapiro & Sitkin, 2006). Just because a reviewer decided to reject the manuscript and listed several fatal flaws, it does not mean that the review should be written in a disrespectful voice. Explaining the reasons for rejection with concrete evidence and suggesting practical solutions are few of the many ways to deliver the bad news without being offensive.

What to gain as a reviewer

With the list of dos and don'ts, being a reviewer may be portrayed as a burdening and a time-consuming task. However, we strongly argue that the experience of being a reviewer will go a long way for scholars who just took a few steps into the academia. Writing a constructive review can lead to drafting a

constructive manuscript. The reviewers can reflect on their own evaluations of the manuscript by organizing what they have learned from the review process (Schepmyer et al., 2006). The repetition of reviewing and reflecting will encourage the scholar to think of practical ways to improve the quality of a manuscript (Loonen et al., 2005). In addition, the peer review process is a source of expert feedback (Bakanic et al., 1989). The reviewer can learn from reading other review comments and the editorial decision when available. By being familiar with insightful reviews, the scholar may be able to assess their own writing objectively and critically. This will be handy when collaborating with other scholars and directing a student's paper in the coming future.

By accumulating the experience as a reviewer, the scholar can contribute to academia as well. According to Beyer et al. (1995), reviewers' recommendations account for close to half of the variance of the editorial decision. For that reason, the reviewer is responsible for not only improving a manuscript with their comments but also preventing substandard research (i.e., those with fatal flaws) from being disseminated as knowledge (Beyer et al., 1995; Shapiro & Sitkin, 2006). Publishing more quality research will consequently improve the journal's value. As more journals are esteemed, academia as a whole will gain credibility and recognition.

Communicating as an Author

Even a research paper with great discoveries can sometimes be rejected by the journals (Campanario, 2009). This indicates that we should not assume that the excellence of research automatically guarantees its publication. After all, any

manuscript needs to prove its own merit of publication and *struggle* to survive the series of the review process. *Struggle* is an understatement, as eight out of ten manuscripts fail to make it to the end of the review process (Greiff & Ziegler, 2017). The acceptance rate of some journals falls to a single digit (Rynes et al., 2005).

The low acceptance rate may be intimidating to those who just started to prepare for their first submission. To help those scholars, the essay gives some recommendations on how to communicate with the reviewers and the editors. As many students practice writing manuscripts by working with their advisors, professors, and colleagues, we acknowledge that there are many other alternative ways to be trained as an author. The purpose of this essay is not to provide an exhaustive list of dos and don'ts, but to address some essential qualities that are applicable in general: being alert, being practically flexible, and being persistent.

What to do as an author

Before clicking the submission button, an author should consider the editor's expectations for the submitted manuscripts. This is because almost half of the submissions receive a desk rejection and fail to get into the hands of the review team (Billsberry, 2014). Although it is not pleasant to receive a desk rejection, the authors need to understand that the editors have the obligation to defend the academic integrity of the journal (Beyer et al., 1995).

To go beyond the desk evaluation, the author should be aware of why certain manuscripts are rejected before it is sent to the reviewers. According to Billsberry (2014), a manuscript is rejected by the editors when it is deviant from the aims and scopes of the journal and when the rationales, findings, and

implications of the manuscript do not have a significant contribution to the field. Thus, the obvious recommendation is to carefully read the aims and scopes as well as the submission guidelines of the target journal.

It is also helpful to verify how relevant the topic or method of the manuscript is by reading some of the published papers in the target journal. If the journal carries a research paper that is similar to the current submission, researchers should go back to their manuscript and find what is unique about it. They must elaborate on the differences to clearly show the contributions of their manuscript. This helps the editors to understand that the submission has something new to offer to the knowledge pool. Furthermore, reading the editorials of the journals can be helpful to novice researchers to understand what kind of manuscript the journal is looking for.

The authors may appeal the academic originality and contribution of their manuscript in their cover letter (Welch, 2007). However, it is advised for the authors to make the selling point of their research to be evident in the manuscript itself. This is because the importance of the cover letter is decreasing as its submission is becoming optional in many journals. In addition, the cover letter is not available to the public. As the academic value of a manuscript is not only important for the editors but also the readers, it should be made clear within the manuscript.

Last but not least, ask around. This entails frequent talking to colleagues, advisors, and professors about how to choose an outlet. Those who have already published a research paper in a specific journal can share their own strategies regarding how to go beyond the desk evaluation and, more importantly, survive the peer review process.

The authors should be reasonably flexible, especially when their submissions are called for revise and resubmit. As only a

handful of fortunate scholars' manuscripts will be accepted at its first attempt at publication, being prepared for a resubmission is more practical and helpful (Annesley, 2011). An invitation for a revision does not guarantee a publication right after the resubmission. It should be understood as jumping over one of the many hurdles, but there are still plenty to go before the finish line.

When given the chance to revise and resubmit, the authors should consider the review process as a team effort with the reviewers and the editors. Because the authors and the reviewers are teammates, it is important for the authors to not only address every concern of the reviewer but also accommodate to the reviewers' comments to a certain extent. According to Smith (2006), expecting all of the reviewers to give objective and consistent comments may be naive and optimistic. We understand that some criticisms are difficult to swallow. Nonetheless, it is important for an author to compromise with the review team to increase the likelihood of publishing their manuscript (Annesley, 2011). A compromise is recommended because the reviewers' evaluations are influential to the editorial decision (Beyer et al., 1995; Miller & Perrucci, 2001).

The authors should respect, not resent, rejections. It is important for less-experienced scholars to be persistent in improving and submitting their manuscripts. Even the manuscripts of the most eminent scholars and the most seminal research paper have experienced rejections (Gans & Shepherd, 1994). Thus, rejections should not be taken personally. It should be used as an opportunity to further improve the quality of the manuscript based on the given comments. In sum, rejections provide opportunities for authors to better understand their work (Donovan, 2007).

What not to do as an author

Along with actions and attitudes that go against the aforementioned communicative strategies as an author, selfishly taking the advantages of the review process should be prohibited. Although the authors may consequently benefit from the review process, they should not submit a manuscript to exploit another expert's time and effort with little intention of publishing it to the journal. For example, the authors should not knowingly submit a substandard manuscript to receive an expert evaluation. This deliberately wastes editors' and reviewers' time, and their opportunity costs (Curtin et al., 2018; Tite & Schroter, 2007).

Although it is dangerous to always regard rejections as the manuscript having fatal flaws or minimal academic value, authors should not make a habit of blaming the rejections on external factors (e.g., wrong outlet, wrong time, wrong decision). A scholar may benefit from using this editorial decision as an opportunity to reflect on the manuscript from a different perspective. On a similar note, Conn (2014) advised against submitting a rejected manuscript to another journal without any revision. The editor's letter not only informs the author about the editorial decision but also contains detailed comments explaining the reasons behind the decision. Given that the comments are constructive, these will help authors to understand which part of their paper needs improvements. It is naive to believe that simply targeting another journal will drastically increase the chance of publishing the manuscript, especially when the shortcomings or flaws of the research addressed in the previous peer review process were not amended. Without any revision, the quality of the manuscript is unlikely to improve. Thus, the author is likely to receive similar comments from other reviewers. More importantly, it is possible for the editors from two different

journals to assign the manuscript to the same reviewer. In this case, the reviewer, who sees the same unrevised manuscript for the second time after rejecting it from the other journal, is extremely unlikely to give a positive evaluation. As a variation of submitting an unrevised manuscript, some scholars may make a list of target journals and submit it to them one after another. The list may be organized in the descending order of the journals' impact factors. By going down the list, the authors foolishly attempt to find a journal that is willing to accept the manuscript as it is. This is a waste of time for both reviewers and authors. Consequently, the review process becomes more onerous than it already is.

For novice scholars, we summarize and recommend communication strategies in Table 1 with what we have discussed. Because the perceived burden of being a reviewer prevents scholars from volunteering to take part in the review process, this essay focuses on how to communicate as a reviewer and an author in order to expedite the review process.

Table 1. The Summary of Communication Strategies for Novice Scholars

Direction of Communication (Means of Communication)	Communication Strategies
Reviewer → Authors (Reviewer's comments of the manuscript)	1. Show respect A. be a coach, not a coauthor B. give constructive and actionable recommendations C. be impartial in the methodology, design, paradigm, and topic of the manuscript, and the significance of the results D. be courteous in the delivery 2. Be cooperative A. refrain from evaluating based on presumptions B. acknowledge that other reviewers can have different opinions

Direction of Communication (Means of Communication)	Communication Strategies
Reviewer → Editor (Confidential comments to editors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Be diligent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. complete the review on time B. devote a sufficient amount of time to the review <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be timely <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. accept or decline the invitation to the review process in a timely manner 2. Build trust <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. communicate concerns or problems that are pertinent to the review process 3. Be consistent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. keep a respective voice to both editors and authors B. the reviewer's comments to the author should be in line with the confidential comments to editors
Author → Editor (Manuscript)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be alert <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. be aware of the editor's expectations of the manuscript (e.g., the aim and scope of the journal) B. adhere to the submission guidelines of the target journal C. clearly state what is unique about the submitted manuscript 2. Be persistent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. do not take rejections personally B. use rejections as an opportunity to improve the manuscript
Author → Reviewer (Response to the reviewers' comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be reasonably flexible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. address every concern of the reviewers B. adhere to the reviewer's comments when possible

Conclusion

The main purpose of this essay was to explain the expected responsibilities of being an author and a reviewer to the

less-experienced scholars. By doing so, they can be better equipped when participating in the reviewer process. In addition, the benefits of taking and understanding the role of the reviewer are discussed in this essay. It should be noted that there are other effective and practical ways to communicate during the review process. Although comparing all the communicative strategies was not the focus of this essay, we encourage future research to collect empirical evidence to investigate different aspects of the review process.

We welcome our perspectives and suggestions to be taken with a grain of salt. Nonetheless, we hope that this essay motivates more scholars, especial less experienced researchers, to take part in the review process. Simply reading about how to participate in the review process is different to actually participating in it. The experience a scholar gains will become a valuable asset both to the academia and the researcher themselves. Hopefully, a norm where fewer scholars perceive the peer review process as a tedious task and more of them consider it as a beneficial experience will be created. It may be naive, but we believe that individuals' small actions will mount to enriching academia as a whole.

References

- Altman, Y., & Baruch, Y. (2008). Strategies for revising and resubmitting papers to refereed journals. *British Journal of Management*, *19*, 89-101. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00542.x
- Annesley, T. M. (2011). Top 10 tips for responding to reviewer and editor comments. *Clinical Chemistry*, *57*, 551-554. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2011.162388
- Bakanic, V., McPhail, C., & Simon, R. J. (1989). Mixed messages: Referees' comments on the manuscripts they review. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *30*, 639-654. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4121469>
- Beyer, J. M., Chanove, R. G., & Fox, W. B. (1995). The review process and the fate of manuscripts submitted to AMJ. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 1219-1260. doi: 10.5465/256856
- Billsberry, J. (2014). Desk-rejects: 10 top tips to avoid the cull. *Journal of Management Education*, *38*, 3-9. doi:10.1177/1052562913517209
- Campanario, J. M. (2009). Rejecting and resisting Nobel class discoveries: Accounts by Nobel Laureates. *Scientometrics*, *81*, 549-565. doi:10.1007/s11192-008-2141-5
- Carpenter, M. A. (2009). Mentoring colleagues in the craft and spirit of peer review. *Academy of Management Review*, *34*, 191-195. doi:10.5465/AMR.2009.36982609
- Carraway, L. N. (2009). Ethics for and responsibilities of authors, reviewers and editors in science. *The American Midland Naturalist*, *161*, 146-164. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20491424>
- Conn, V. S. (2014). Should author revise a rejected manuscript prior to submitting to a new journal? *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *36*, 955-956. doi:10.1177/0193945914531698
- Corley, K. G., & Schinoff, B. S. (2017). Who, me? An inductive study of novice experts in the context of how editors come to understand theoretical contribution. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *31*, 4-27. doi:10.5465/amp.2015.0131
- Curtin, P. A., Russial, J., & Tefertiller, A. (2018). Reviewers' perceptions

- of the peer review process in journalism and mass communication. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 95, 278-299. doi:10.1177/1077699017736031
- Davison, R. M., de Vreede, G.-J., & Briggs, R. O. (2005). On peer review standards for the information systems literature. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 16, 967-980. doi:10.17705/1C AIS.01649
- Donovan, S. K. (2007). The importance of resubmitting rejected papers. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 38, 151-155. doi: 10.3138/W706-5884-KG84-J282
- Dusansky, R., & Vernon, C. J. (1998). Rankings of U.S. economics departments. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12, 157-170. doi:10.1257/jep.12.1.157
- Froese, F. J., & Bader, K. (2019). Surviving the desk-review. *Asian Business and Management*, 18, 1-5. doi:10.1057/s41291-019-00060-8
- Gans, J. S., & Shepherd, G. B. (1994). How are the mighty fallen: Rejected classic articles by leading economists. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8, 165-179. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2138157>
- Glidewell, J. C. (1988). Reflections on thirteen years of editing AJCP. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16, 759-770. doi:10.1007/BF00930891
- Graves, P. E., Marchand, J. R., & Thompson, R. (1982). Economics departmental rankings: Research incentives, constraints, and efficiency. *The American Economic Review*, 72, 1131-1141. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1812028>
- Greiff, S., & Ziegler, M. (2017). How to make sure your paper is desk rejected. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 33, 75-78. doi:10.1027/1015-5759/a000419
- Lepak, D. (2009). Editor's comments: What is good reviewing? *Academy of Management Review*, 34, 375-381. doi: 10.5465/amr.2009.40631320
- Loonen, M. P. J., Hage, J. J., & Kon, M. (2005). Who benefits from peer review? An analysis of the outcome of 100 requests for review by

- plastic and reconstructive surgery. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, 116, 1461-1472. doi:10.1097/01.prs.0000178796.82273.7c
- Miller, J., & Perrucci, R. (2001). Back stage at social problems: An analysis of the editorial decision process, 1993-1996. *Social Problems*, 48, 93-110. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>.
- Northcraft, G. B., & Tenbrunsel, A. E. (2011). Effective matrices, decision frames, and cooperation in volunteer dilemmas: A theoretical perspective on academic peer review. *Organization Science*, 22, 1277-1285. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0607
- Raelin, J. A. (2008). Refereeing the game of peer review. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 7, 124-129. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2008.31413869>
- Rynes, S. L., Hillman, A., Ireland, D., Kirkman, B., Law, K., Miller, C. C., ... Shapiro, D. (2005). From the editors: Everything you've always wanted to know about "AMJ" (but may have been afraid to ask). *The Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 732-737. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20159692>
- Sauer, R. D. (1988). Estimates of the returns to quality and coauthorship in economic academia author. *Journal of Political Economy*, 96, 855-866. Retrieved from <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/261566>
- Scargle, J. D. (2000). Publication Bias: The "file-drawer" problem in scientific inference. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 14, 91-106.
- Schepmyer, H., van Emmerik, I. J. H., & Oliver, C. (2006). Advice for the novice reviewer. In Y. Baruch, S. E. Sullivan, & H. N. Schepmyer (Eds.), *Winning reviews: A guide for evaluating scholarly writing* (pp. 65-78). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schwartz, S. J., & Zamboanga, B. L. (2009). The peer-review and editorial system: Ways to fix something that might be broken. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 54-61. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01106.x
- Shapiro, D. L., & Sitkin, S. B. (2006). Fairness as a key criterion in reviewing. In Y. Baruch, S. E. Sullivan, & H. N. Schepmyer (Eds.),

- Winning reviews: A guide for evaluating scholarly writing* (pp. 79-88). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shaw, J. D. (2012). Responding to reviewers. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 1261-1263. doi:10.5465/amj.2012.4006
- Shugan, S. M. (2007). The editor's secrets. *Marketing Science*, 26, 589-595. doi:10.1287/mksc.1070.0309
- Shim, J.-C. (2018). Challenges, barriers, and opportunities for global recognition. *Asian Communication Research*, 15(3), 5-19. doi:10.20879/acr.2018.15.3.5
- Smith, R. (2006). Peer review: A flawed process at the heart of science and journals. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 99, 178-182. doi:10.1258/jrsm.99.4.178
- Sterling, T. D. (1959). Publication decisions and their possible effects on inferences drawn from tests of significance—or vice versa. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 54(285), 30-34.
- Sullivan, S. E., Crocitto, M., & Carraher, S. M. (2006). The fundamentals of reviewing. In Y. Baruch, S. E. Sullivan, & H. N. Schepmyer (Eds.), *Winning reviews: A guide for evaluating scholarly writing* (pp. 65-78). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taylor, S. (2003). Big R (versus little r) reviewers: The anonymous coauthor. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31, 341-343. doi:10.1177/0092070303254136
- Tite, L., & Schroter, S. (2007). Why do peer reviewers decline to review? A survey. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 61, 9-12. doi:10.1136/jech.2006.049817
- Treviño, L. K. (2008). Editor's comments: Why review? Because reviewing is a professional responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 8-10. doi:10.5465/amr.2008.27744831
- Tuckman, H. P., & Leahey, J. (1975). What is an article worth? *Journal of Political Economy*, 83, 951-968. doi:10.1086/260371
- Walsh, G. (2014). Being a JBR reviewer. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 2239-2240. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.01.001

- Ward, P., Graber, K. C., & van der Mars, H. (2015). Writing quality peer reviews of research manuscripts. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 34*, 700-715. doi:10.1123/jtpe.2014-0158
- Welch, S. J. (2007). Avoiding common problems during online submission of manuscripts. *Chest, 131*, 1591-1594. doi:10.1378/chest.06-2906

Submission:	September 3, 2019
Review:	November 12, 2019
Decision of publication:	December 10, 2019