How to be an academic peer reviewer

Source: https://bit.ly/3gQg0Ah

- **Read the article fully –** please read the full text of the article and view all associated figures, tables and data;
- **Be thorough –** a peer review report should discuss the article in full as well as individual points, and should demonstrate your understanding of the article;
- **Be specific –** your comments should contain as much detail as possible, with references where appropriate, so the authors are able to fully address the issue;
- **Be constructive in your criticism –** do not hesitate to include any concerns or criticisms you may have in your review, however, please do so in a constructive and respectful manner;
- **Avoid derogatory comments or tone –** review as you wish to be reviewed and ensure that your comments focus on the scientific content of the article in question rather than the authors themselves.

Stay in scope "Keep comments within the scope of the paper." -Sheila McCormick, University of California, Berkeley	**If it's good, say so** "Don't be afraid to be positive. If a paper that you are asked to review is really good, say so!" -Anthony Imbalzano, University of Massachusetts Medical School
Focus on the science "If the paper is in English, but not written by a native speaker, please be tolerant and just point out anything which changes the meaning." -Sue Malcom, University College London	**Be constructive** "View your reviewer role as an opportunity to help improve the paper you are reviewing." -Bruce MacIver, Stanford University
Organize your comments "When listing your specific concerns, separate them into 'major' and 'minor' points and, if your list is very long, consolidate the most minor points." -Robert Fisher, Mount Sinai School of Medicine	**Consider the statistics** "It's helpful if you comment on the number of replicates, the controls, and the statistical analyses. This information is crucial for understanding how robust the outcome is." -Christine Mummery, Leiden University Medical Center

RESEARCH ARTICLE

- Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?
- Is the study design appropriate and does the work have academic merit?
- Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?
- If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?
- Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?
- Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW ARTICLE

- Are the rationale for, and objectives of, the Systematic Review clearly stated?
- Are sufficient details of the methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?
- Is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?
- Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results presented in the review?

REVIEW ARTICLE

- Is the topic of the review discussed comprehensively in the context of the current literature?
- Are all factual statements correct and adequately supported by citations?
- Is the review written in accessible language?
- Are the conclusions drawn appropriate in the context of the current research literature?

Adapted from F1000 Research. @OpenAcademics