

Smarthinking Tutor Response Form

Your tutor has written overview comments about your essay in the form below. Your tutor has also embedded comments **[in bold and in brackets]** within your essay. Thank you for choosing Smarthinking to help you improve your writing!

Hello, Sipeng! My name is Natalie H., and I look forward to working with you on this **Essay Centre Review** to improve your writing today. Let's get started!

***Writing Strength:** You clearly explain the flaws of the peer review process:

The process of peer review is prone fault. Editors and reviewers can be biased for or against the work the work of authors but having several reviewers can reduce the chances of this bias occurring (Mann & Schmidt, 2005). Furthermore, the article review process taxing and so sometimes the anonymous reviewers do not give the necessary time and effort

Good work! 😊

Introduction/Conclusion While your introduction defines the peer review process well -

process of peer review involves the scrutiny of the ideas, research design, data collection, interpretations and assumptions of the author by other experts whose goal is identify and correct mistakes, unclear language, and claims that are not backed by evidence (*Peer review and the IPCC*, 2019).

It does not really prepare the reader for what you will discuss in the essay, such as discuss the possible concerns with the process, its most optimum uses, personal uses, etc. Consider adding a sentence or two in the introduction that mentions these aspects so that the reader is more adequately prepared for the content that will follow.

***Sipeng 11621729, you requested help with Content Development:** One section of your paper seems to contradict itself:

. This is due to my realization that sometimes bad papers sneak through to publishing due to the review process being demanding and the reviewers enjoying anonymity. The realization of this fact has made me stop absolutely trusting articles simply because they are from peer-reviewed journals.

The peer review process is the best approach for reporting climate change findings. This is because it helps to prevent highly repeated research from being published, which would be a waste of the time of the readers who expect novel knowledge (Laframboise, 2016). Furthermore, research is based on previous research and no researcher would want the foundational research for his/her research to be flawed. Peer review helps to prevent this problem from occurring by working to ensure that the research articles that are published are accurate and reliable

In the first section, you note how you distrust peer reviews; however, in the very next section you state that it is the best approach for reporting certain findings. This seeming shift in opinion is a little jarring and confusing to the reader. If you do not trust the process or its results, why is it so wise to apply it to this other set of findings?

***Sipeng 11621729, you requested help with Word Choice:** Your section listing the steps in the process is a little awkwardly phrased:

The process begins with a researcher choosing the most suitable journal through which to publish his/her research. This step is followed by the writer writing his/her research and submitting the work to the journal. The researcher's submission of his or her research is followed by its assessment by an editor.

Rather than say longer phrases like "this step is followed by," consider shorter, clearer transitional phrases like "next" or "second."

Summary of Next Steps:

- Introduce your subtopics (cons of the review process, etc.) in the first paragraph.
- Explain possible contradictions noted.
- Use shorter, clearer transitions.

Thank you for submitting your essay for a review, Sipeng. I enjoyed helping you with this step in the revision process. Have a good day!

Natalie H. 😊

You can find more information about writing, grammar, and usage in the [Smarthinking Writer's Handbook](#).

Please look for comments **[in bold and in brackets]** in your essay below.
Thank you for sub

Reflection on Peer Review

Peer review is a screening process whose objective is to decrease the likelihood of publishing articles that have egregious mistakes, and in most cases improves the published papers in comparison to how they were initially written. The process of peer review involves the scrutiny of the ideas, research design, data collection, interpretations and assumptions of the author by other experts whose goal is identify and correct mistakes, unclear language, and claims that are not backed by evidence (*Peer review and the IPCC*, 2019).

The process begins with a researcher choosing the most suitable journal through which to publish his/her research. This step is followed by the writer writing his/her research and submitting the work to the journal. The researcher's submission of his or her research is followed by its assessment by an editor. The editor performs the roles of deciding whether the work of the researcher deserves consideration and to act as a link between the researcher and the reviewers. The editor either rejects the work of the researcher or sends to anonymous reviewers (typically 2/3). It is crucial that that the research does not know the identity of the reviewers to ensure the credibility of the peer review process.

The reviewers go through the submitted work and write a comprehensive critique ("review"). These "reviews" are sent back to the editor, who from them chooses to take one of the following courses of action: (1) Publishing the article in its original state (this is rare) (2) rejecting the article due to being deeply flawed; the journal *Science* only publishes less than 8% of the articles it receives (3) Sending the article back to the researcher for a revision or revisions and then publishing it (this is usually the most common occurrence) (Nature Change, 2019; *Peer review and the IPCC*, 2019). The revision process occurs two to three times over a time frame of several months but can take longer.

The process of peer review is prone fault. **[It looks like a word is missing here.]** Editors and reviewers can be biased for or against the work the work of authors but having several reviewers can reduce the chances of this bias occurring (Mann & Schmidt, 2005). Furthermore, the article review process taxing and so sometimes the anonymous reviewers do not give the necessary time and effort allowing faulty papers to proceed to publication (*Peer review and the IPCC*, 2019). **[You are missing a linking verb in this sentence. Proofread carefully.]** Due to these drawbacks in the peer review process, a large room for improvement remains.

I had previous knowledge that articles published in peer-reviewed journals have gone through the process of review by experts on the topic have been approved for publication. However, it did not cross my mind these research articles sometimes go through revision(s) prior to publication. Furthermore, the literature on the peer-review process has opened my eyes to the fact that articles are not of reliable quality simply because they are published on peer-reviewed journals. This is due to my realization that sometimes bad papers sneak through to publishing due to the review process being demanding and the reviewers enjoying anonymity. The realization of this fact has made me stop absolutely trusting articles simply because they are from peer-reviewed journals.

The peer review process is the best approach for reporting climate change findings. This is because it helps to prevent highly repeated research from being published, which would be a waste of the time of the readers who expect novel knowledge (Laframboise, 2016). Furthermore, research is based on previous research and no researcher would want the foundational research for his/her research to be flawed. Peer review helps to prevent this problem from occurring by working to ensure that the research articles that are published are accurate and reliable. Without proper peer review a ripple effect of flawed research could result. **[Use a comma after an introductory prepositional phrase to set it apart from the independent clause.]**

Our own peer review process was very useful in ensuring that we had a more thorough paper ultimately. The process helped us to ensure that our research methods were the most suitable for the research, our interpretations were correct, and that our ideas were more understandable or clear to the reader. The result was a more rigorous paper than we could have had without the peer review process.

The process of performing the peer-review process ourselves gave us an understanding of how much effort goes into the vetting process before papers are published and the pitfalls involved in the process. We realized that the vetting process is highly demanding requiring beforehand thorough understanding of the process and a high level of keenness and time commitment. We also realized that the pitfalls of: a lack of a comprehensive understanding of the topic, the taxing nature of the process, pressure from peers, and the opportunity for anonymity exist in the peer review process (*Peer review and the IPCC*, 2019).

There are a number of merits of the peer reviewed process. One merit is that greatly prevents substandard of poor-quality research from getting published. In other words, it ensures that the published research is virtually all of high quality. It helps to ensure that future research is based on a right/accurate foundation, furthering scientific progress (*Scrutinizing science*, 2019). Peer review also has the merit of ensuring that articles that are highly replicate are not published, promoting the novelty of the research that is performed by scientists, adding new knowledge to the topic of climate science and other scientific topics (Laframboise, 2016). Based on the previous premise that the process of peer review is not fool proof, it can be improved by ensuring that editors and reviewers are experts of the topic in question. The process can also be improved by ensuring that researchers, editors, and reviewers have only a professional relationship to prevent publication bias. Peer review can also be improved by reviewers and editors being dedicated to their roles since the task is demanding and they can easily escape botching the process. Reviewers and editors should also resist pressure from the rest of the scientific community to only approve articles that correspond to popular opinion (Wight, 2010).

References

- Laframboise, D. (2016). Peer Review — Why Skepticism Is Essential | The Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF). Retrieved 18 November 2019, from <https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:FB9B4kwhLU8J:https://www.thegwpf.org/donna-laframboise-peer-review-why-skepticism-is-essential/+&cd=1&hl=sw&ct=clnk&gl=ke>
- Mann, M., & Schmidt, G. (2005). Peer Review: A Necessary But Not Sufficient Condition. Retrieved 18 November 2019, from <http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2005/01/peer-review-a-necessary-but-not-sufficient-condition/>
- Nature Change. (2019). Peer Review and Publication | Nature Climate Change. Retrieved 18 November 2019, from <https://www.nature.com/nclimate/for-authors/peer-review-and-publication>
- Peer review and the IPCC*. (2019). Presentation.
- Scrutinizing science: Peer review. (2019). Retrieved 18 November 2019, from https://undsci.berkeley.edu/article/howscienceworks_16
- Wight, J. (2010). Climategate and the peer-review process. Retrieved 18 November 2019, from <https://skepticalscience.com/Peer-review-process.htm>

