2025 ASC ANNUAL CONFERENCE REVIEWER WEBINAR



November 20th, 2024

<u>Editorial Board</u>

Editor – Wes Collins

Associate Editor – Anthony Perrenoud

Associate Editor – John Posillico

WEBINAR AGENDA (30-45 MINUTES)

- Providing helpful reviewer feedback
- A good peer review
- Recommendations for reviewers
- Items to consider
- EasyChair process
- Review timeline
- Discussion

PROVIDING HELPFUL Reviewer Feedback

- Very Helpful
- Somewhat Helpful
- Vague, unclearLate



REVIEWER 1

- Overall The paper is a review of other scheduling software papers. The addition to the body of knowledge is through the evaluation of scheduling software in a graduate level CM course.
- Flow chart in Fig. 1 is odd with a major break in the middle which is not described in the paper.
- Paragraph 2 in Methodology starts multiple sentences with "For example." If these are all examples they should be in a list or otherwise broken up.
- Formatting References include indents, which is not correct according to the ASC Style Guide. Please revise.
- Writing There are a few capitalization, punctuation and syntax issues that should be corrected overall. As a minimum, spell check should be used. Overall, a research paper should not include contractions.

REVIEWER 2

- Overall I don't understand the usefulness of this paper/ It is more of a summary of prior studies.
- an explanation of figure 1 is needed.
- Writing ferequently spelling.

A GOOD PEER REVIEWER

- Is a content expert who can perform a critical analysis of the submission
- Provides specific comments regarding the submission's merit to the ASC community
- Provides clear recommendations to authors on how to improve the submission
- Provides recommendations to the editor regarding the submission

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Preparation for Writing the Review

- Conduct a quick read
- Identify any fatal flaws
- Detailed read
- Determine the relevance of the work
- Detailed critique of all aspects of the manuscript (major and minor flaws)
- Final scan
- Summarize organization, formatting, writing, clarity

Robert J. DiDomenico, Pharm.D., BCPS-AQ Cardiology, FCCP, FHFSA, William L. Baker, Pharm.D., FCCP, FACC, FAHA, Stuart T. Haines, Pharm.D., FASHP, FCCP, FAPhA, **Improving peer review: What reviewers can do**, *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, Volume 74, Issue 24, 15 December 2017, Pages 2080–2084, https://doi.org/10.2146/ajhp170190

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVIEWERS



- Summarize overall assessment
- Be objective and constructive with actionable suggestions

Robert J. DiDomenico, Pharm.D., BCPS-AQ Cardiology, FCCP, FHFSA, William L. Baker, Pharm.D., FCCP, FACC, FAHA, Stuart T. Haines, Pharm.D., FASHP, FCCP, FAPhA, **Improving peer review: What reviewers can do**, *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, Volume 74, Issue 24, 15 December 2017, Pages 2080–2084, https://doi.org/10.2146/ajhp170190







DON'T USE AI FOR REVIEWS!

WE WANT YOU!

ITEMS TO Consider

- Title
 - Does the title fully convey the research described in the paper?
- Abstract
 - Does the abstract fully describe the paper, including methodology and findings?
- Formatting
 - Is the formatting correct?
 - \circ $\,$ Is the paper too long?
 - Does it read as if it was cut from something else (dissertation, book chapter) and not formatted specifically for the conference?
 - Are the references complete and correct?

ITEMS TO Consider

- Tables and figures
 - Do they make sense and are they legible?
 - Have they been appropriately described in the text?
 - Are they absolutely necessary?
- Lit review
 - Is this paper an exercise in self-citation?
 - Are the citations correct?
 - Are the citations from reputable academicfocused sources?
- Methodology
 - Is the methodology fully described?
 - Is the methodology sound and appropriate for publishable research, including where data came from?

ITEMS TO Consider

- Discussion of findings
 - Are the findings tied to what was presented in the literature review, i.e., what is the departure point?
 - Has the author overstated the value of their findings?
 - Has the author inappropriately analyzed their findings?
- Conclusions, limitations, and future research
 - Are limitations mentioned?
 - Is future research mentioned?
- References
 - Are all the references in the paper listed in the reference list?

EASYCHAIR PROCESS

https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=ASC2025

REVIEW TIMELINE

November 22nd to December 6th – Paper review & voting of acceptance

December 20th – Author notification

January 11th, 2025 – Author revision & final paper acceptance

April 22nd to April 25th – Annual conference – Calgary, Alberta, Canada

http://ascpro.ascweb.org/

DISCUSSION

As an author, what feedback in a review is helpful for you?

QUESTIONS?

