

Editorial. Key Principles of Peer Review

Dinara Bisimbaeva

Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia

E-mail: editorial.team12@gmail.com

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4273-8754>

DOI: 10.26907/esd.18.4.01

EDN: AUJWYC

Almost all my editorials were written drawing on the experience of working with authors. The articles examined issues that were considered controversial or challenging for authors. However, this editorial will focus on another important participants of the publication process, i.e. reviewers. Earlier we wrote about the history of peer review and discussed the need of open reviewing (Rushby, 2020), this time I am going to cover key principles of peer review.

During a review process a scholarly paper is subject to a meticulous analysis from peers who are specialists in the same field as authors. Peer review ensures that articles meet the quality requirements and high standards in a given discipline (Kelly et al., 2014). This process filters out low quality manuscripts (ibid, 2014).

There are different peer review methods: open, single-blind, double-blind, public, cascading, and public disclosure (Smart, 2018). Despite this diversity, probably the widely used type is double-blind peer review. It is a model when the identity of authors and reviewers is not disclosed. This ensures objectivity which is perceived as a great advantage of double-blind review. However, this model can be criticized due to a lack of transparency (Rushby, 2020). Among other disadvantages is long review times (Kelly et al., 2014). Despite these drawbacks, the scientific community is not ready to switch over to alternative models of peer review.

Each editorial office has its own criteria for reviewers. Apart from requirements, journals develop their own guidelines for reviewing manuscripts. Clear instructions and recommendations make it easier for referees to review a scientific paper effectively. But does everyone succeed in writing a high-quality and professional review? Young professionals who have recently become reviewers are advised to follow valuable Lucey's (2013) advice on how to review effectively:

1. Be professional
2. Be pleasant
3. Read the invite
4. Be helpful
5. Be scientific
6. Be timely
7. Be realistic
8. Be empathetic
9. Be open
10. Be organised

I would like to emphasize that when writing a review, it is important to show respect to authors. I think I am not wrong if I say that all reviewers are authors themselves. Therefore, referees should carry out a review in a way as they would like to receive it from their colleagues. Authors in their turn need to be respectful of reviewers' opinions and if a review features some critical comments, they should consider them as growth points.

But how authors respond to reviewers' comments is a topic for another discussion and editorial.

Going back to the ten principles of good peer review by Lucey (2013), I would recommend that reviewers of Education and Self Development Journal adhere to them as well. Our journal publishes submissions in two languages. Thus, we have Russian and English language reviewers. Over the course of our work, we have some long-serving referees. I sincerely thank all reviewers who take part in our auctions. We appreciate your help. The Journal is open to cooperation and we would be happy to welcome new reviewers. Join our team!

References

- Kelly, J., Sadeghieh, T., & Adeli, K. (2014). Peer review in scientific publications: benefits, critiques, & a survival guide. *EJIFCC*, 25(3), 227–243.
- Lucey, B. (2013, September 27). Peer Review: How to Get It Right – 10 Tips. *The Guardian*. <http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2013/sep/27/peer-review-10-tips-research-paper>
- Rushby, N. (2020). Editorial. Open Reviewing. *Education and Self Development*, 15(1), 6–8. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd15.1.01>
- Smart, P. (2018). *Handbook for Journal Editors*. INASP.