

Peer Review Process – Editors’ Thoughts

R. Sundaralingam

sundar.microbe@gmail.com

In much of society, research means to investigate something you do not know or understand. Objective of research is one of the important elements for conducting any research because it helps in determining the possibility of conducting the study.

Basically, the broad aim of all researches is to confirm the reliability of existing knowledge and to find the deviation of existing knowledge. The purpose of any research article is to assist researchers in writing organized and concise articles. While the basis of any good article is the quality of the study it describes, the chances of the article being published and communicating results effectively to readers can be improved through effective writing.

Even though scientific research are constructed and conducted in an objective and unbiased manner, science provides for two significant pitfalls - potential mistakes in evidence collection and conclusions reached after the research. In order to overcome these major pitfalls, peer review process is required.

Peer review is a process of subjecting research objectives, methods and findings to the scrutiny of other experts in the same field. The process is designed to prevent dissemination of irrelevant findings, unwarranted claims, unacceptable interpretations and personal views.

Peer-reviewed articles provide a trusted form of scientific communication. The review process is long and straight-forward. Peer review is generally seen as vital for the roles of forming an archive of knowledge and distributing rewards. Peer review acts a quality control mechanism for journals by filtering out substandard papers and bad science and thereby ensures that only good research is published. The value of peer review is based on the assumption that it provides a valid measure of the quality of a manuscript and its adherence to the norms of the field. Its value is also tied to providing feedback so that a manuscript can be improved through revision.

Peer reviewing allows a diversity of opinions to be brought to the table, theoretically removing any personal biases and pre-set ideas from the equation. This peer-review process ensures that the author has discussed and explained contradictory theories and considered whether the results obtained are general or due to carefully chosen specific experiments. It also ensures that conclusions drawn are well supported by evidence and that enough information is contained for experiments to be repeated and the results verified.

The criteria by which a publication can be judged as suitable can vary, but is also likely to include criteria such as technical accuracy, whether the results can be generalised, relevance, timeliness, etc. This process is in place to ensure that the published work has a certain level of quality.

The Peer review process is considered essential, but has also been criticized as slow, ineffective and misunderstood. Due to the need for the article to be reviewed by other people, feedback to be provided and the paper amended in light of comments from the reviewers, publication, particularly in a journal, can take some time.

In researchers’ point of view, Peer review and publication are time-consuming, frequently involving more than a year between submission and publication. Peer reviewed publications may also have the issue of requiring a paid subscription in order to access the content, which therefore restricts access to the material.

While the large majority of respondents expressed themselves satisfied with the peer review system used by scholarly journals, a minority (12%) said they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

Final Insights about Peer Review

The process of peer-review in science is an old one and one that is important to the essence of what science is and what it is supposed to do.

If someone continuously complains about it, then they should ask themselves, What is the motivation behind their research ideas -

1. Is their research ideas are happened to get burned by one reviewer?
2. Is it perhaps because their ideas really don't pass any scientific muster?
3. Whether their ideas don't fit with every other observation?
4. Or they require an extraordinary new premise to be true without sufficient evidence to back it up?

**FOR PEER REVIEW TO WORK EFFECTIVELY,
THE ROLE OF AN EDITOR IS CRUCIAL**