Peer review—reject, accept, or major revision?

The Lancet Neurology


Summarize: A few of the main arguments that the article points out is that peer review has been around for 300 years, but only recently has it been questioned. Also, the author raises the question of why peer review is so important if it has never been scientifically proven, therefore, would it be necessary at all? Basically, the author is getting at the willingness of people to accept things that have simply “been around” for a long time without questioning it.

Assess: I think this article will be very useful to me when I begin writing my paper; the information is reliable but it is also made up of the author’s specific point of view. I can use that to help steer my own paper in the right direction. The goal of this article is to get people to question the peer review process a little more.

Reflect: The article was very helpful to me because it talks about The Lancet’s specific peer review process; something that was extremely difficult to find online. I will use this to steer my own paper because the author’s views agree with my own.

Rita Douda


Summarize: this article appears to be an interview, set up in Q and A form. The main points are that The Lancet’s peer review process is as unbiased and fair as possible. The point of the article is to get across that The Lancet has a very specific method for choosing to publish articles and that the whole process is fair and regulated.
Assess: The article is going to be vital to my paper because it sums up The Lancet’s entire peer review process down to every detail. This is probably a better source of information than the other article because it’s so detailed. The information; however, could be biased because the person answering the questions could be from The Lancet and more apt to make the journal look good. The goal of the source is to assure that The Lancet has a fair peer review process.

Reflect: My find will be very helpful to me because of the great specific details, exact numbers of physicians that peer review etc. The article may shift my thoughts that all peer review is biased but I’m still sticking with my theory that it is.

Merna Zora
English 1190


Summary: The article talks about The Lancet’s history and how it has become so successful over the past 150 years. It quotes, “The as now, both topical and readable, The Lancet set its standards from the first sentence.” This article talks very highly about The Lancet, giving the journal a good reputation.

Assess: The article is very good at letting people know how much of a reliable source The Lancet is. However, peer review is not mentioned at all in here, so I curious to know more about The Lancet and why it is such a respected journal in the medical field.

Reflect: This is a good source to answer the question about The Lancet’s reputation. Of course, this is only one article; there could be many different opinions about The Lancet. I am going to have to research it more to fully understand the impact it has on the medical field.

Faddy Ishaya


Summarize: This article compared reviewers’ recommendations and their influence on editorial decisions in The Lancet, and the Croatian Medical Journal. This article did a study about reviewers and editors and how the responded to article they have edited. “The distribution of reviewers’ recommendations suggest that the reviewers for The Lancet perceived it as a rigorous journal that sought critical reviews, and more often suggested rejection”.

Assess: I think this is a great source to get an idea of the Lancet journal. I think this information is not completely reliable because it was written by the CMJ, which is being compared to the Lancet journal. I think this article is bias because the author is comparing the journal he works for to a journal that is more popular and bigger.

Reflect: This article fits into my research because I will be using information from this article to help complete my paper. I wouldn’t say it’s the greatest source but it helped me get an idea of someone else’s though about The Lancet Medical Journal.

Michelle Riggs
Hugh Culik

Annotated Bib Scholarly


Summary: The main purpose of this article is to show that “peer review is a flawed process at the heart of science and journals”. The peer review process has been around for nearly 20 years and is just now being questioned. In this article they begin to discuss the defects of peer review and how it needs to be improved slightly. All reviewers are biased and it is impossible to find someone who is not. The article believes the process of peer review has been abused and people need to be retrained to learn how to review properly.

Assess: After reading more about this journal I endeavor to understand the process of peer review they use and this is what I found. It is utterly impossible to run across a peer reviewer that is not biased, it is in your human nature to judge when reading an article. From this article I came across about the Lancets peer review, they claim “The Lancet has tried to get round the problem by agreeing to consider the protocols for studies yet to be done. If it thinks the protocol sound and if the protocol is followed, the Lancet will publish the final results regardless of whether they are positive or negative.” The article claims that their review process is not very strict and the Lancet has only so many reviewers to read the thousands of articles they receive and they begin to rate articles on their titles and introduction paragraphs.
Reflection: The main purpose of this next paper we are writing is to find the credibility of the medical journal The Lancet. I need to research its background and editing process and how the Lancet decides which articles they are going to publish in their journal. The Lancet has their own filter system of peer review that is different from all other journals. You need to look into the Lancets citation rates and if the reviewers check if the website they used is valid. Other important information I need to look in to is the reputation of this journal and its credibility. As well as the audience who is reading this journal.

Jonathan Huff


Summarize: This Article was based off of a current medical issue, and the thought of the reviewer. The peer reviewer's thoughts to more go against the author's thoughts. In other words a good conflict. The author says that peer review comes down to being a trust between the two parties of the author from the coming article and the reviewer. The author also touches base of how there is no actual consequences for peer review misconduct.

Assess: Yes i believe this information to be reliable because it comes directly from The Lancet it's self. It compares with our current research by naming the benefits from The Lancets peer review process. The information is objective and has central area to land, which is peer review and the goal of this source bind to different world's of article's owner and the peer reviewer.

Reflect: This information was helpful to me by actually bring up the topic of misconduct with peer review and how it effects the actual reviewer. Also the information of the author describing a "trust" bond with a peer reviewed article and the peer reviewer helped me understand what goes though the head of the head of the author who submitted the article.

Samantha Grace
Professor Hugh Culik
ENGL 1190
February 13, 2011
Summary: this article seems to be about the dispute between two editors over an article. That leading article was then changed without informing the original author who was one of those editors. This article seems to show the difficulty in publishing articles as an author.

Assess: This article is going to be vital for my paper because it finally shows a different aspect of The Lancet. In the article one editor said they had followed the usual peer review process of The Lancet. With what the article had articulated and with what the author said this is not true.

Reflect: This article is going to be helpful to me because I can form a different decision on The Lancet and its reputation rather than it being the world’s leading independent general medical journal read by influential physicians.

Christina Sceglio
Professor Hugh Culik
ENGL. 1190-C1603
February 14, 2011

Scholarly

Summary: This is an online book for editorial peer review. It has ten chapters that explain peer review and how it works. In order from each chapter it gives you details about the introduction to the editorial peer review process, the rejected manuscripts, editors and editorial boards: who they are and what they do, the authorship problem, the role of review, reviewer agreement, reviewers and their biases, peer review and statistical review, peer review in an electronic environment, and the conclusions about studies of editorial peer review.

Assess: I think this is a good source because it give readers a lot of details about peer review, and what steps the reviewers have to take to review the manuscript. This book touches base on many different levels that we are trying to use to write our paper.

Reflection: This source was very helpful for me because I’m trying to figure out how exactly peer review works. To me, peer review is still quite confusing, and I think this book helped me a lot to answer all of those questions.
Adam Ponton

Promoting research into peer review: an invitation to join in. (research network established by editors of the British Medical Journal, the Lancet and others) (Editorial).


http://find.galegroup.com.libproxy.macomb.edu/gtx/retrieve.do?contentSet=IAC-Documents&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&qrySerId=Locale%28en%2C%2C%29%3AFFE%3D%28KE%2CNone%2C30%29the+lancet+peer+review+process%24&sgHitCountType=None&inPS=true&sort=DateDescend&searchType=BasicSearchForm&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&searchId=R12&currentPosition=1&userGroupName=lom_macombbcc&docId=A15679714&docType=IAC

Summarize: This article is about the BMJ, The Lancet, and others who started a congress for peer review and research.

Asses: This article could be useful for me to show how the Lancet has somewhat tried to improve the peer review process.

Reflect: This article though does not have the The Lancet’s peer review process, I still believe it will be of some use for the essay.

__________

Diana Huynh
ENG 1190
February 13, 2011
Prof Culik


Summary : This article was how The Lancet became to be what is it today and how it got started. It goes in depth with who played parts in The Lancet and their backgrounds to what benefitted the upbringing.
Assess: I believe to judge an article you have to get the background information of it and how it started off. This article provides all of that and more of each person and the problems the Lancet came to the upbringing of it. I believe this article to be a good source coming from The British Medical Journal.

Reflection: This information was helpful to be for my background information and learning more about The Lancet. It will also help me a little bit with some information I will be using in my paper for references.

________________________________________
Carlye Meadows
Hugh Culik
ENGL 1190
February 14, 2011


Summarize: this article is about the lancet and how the lancet uses the peer review process to decide whether journals are credible or not. The lancet has a different way of using the peer review process though. It’s not the way we are used to recognizing the process. There are a selected about of experts that goes through around eight thousand pieces of writing and they are the ones who decide what credible and what’s not.

Asses: I think the article has a lot of useful information within it. The only downfall with this source of writing is that it is written within book format. The information is actually from an advancement of science book, other than a regular website that is on the internet. Other than that this was a very good resource for me and understanding the lancet.

Reflect: I found this article in the Macomb databases library under JSTOR and it talks about everything that we are learning in class because not only does it talk about the main topic of peer review but it also explains the lancet. This is a valuable source for our next assignment because our next assignment is all about the lancet and how it goes about the peer review process.

________________________________________
Diana Huynh
ENG 1190
February 13, 2011
Prof Culik

Summary : This article was how The Lancet became to be what is it today and how it got started. It goes in depth with who played parts in The Lancet and their backgrounds to what benefitted the upbringing.

Assess : I believe to judge an article you have to get the background information of it and how it started off. This article provides all of that and more of each person and the problems the Lancet came to the upbringing of it. I believe this article to be a good source coming from The British Medical Journal.

Reflection : This information was helpful to be for my background information and learning more about The Lancet. It will also help me a little bit with some information I will be using in my paper for references.

__________________________
David Broick


Summary
On their website The Lancet claims they have an impact factor of 28.400 and is ranked second in the general medicine by ISI Journal Citation Reports. This article explains impact factor and its shortcomings. Impact factor is used as a quality ranking tool by measuring the citation rate of the entire journal. It is argued that a journals impact factor is unrelated to scientific quality. Also, an uncited article receives the same impact factor as its journal.

Assess
This source is useful for understanding the drawbacks of impact factors but not much of its benefits.

Reflect
researching impact factor helped me understand what The Lancet bases their reputation on. This article can be used to argue against citation rates as a measure of quality of a journal.

__________________________
Tatiana Anderson
Professor:Hugh Culik
English 1190
January 24, 2011

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1420798/

Summary: This article introduces the reader to the concept of what a peer review is, if a peer review works, and what it is for. The article also provides some information on how to improve a peer review, the defects, and the trust in science it has.

Assess: I found this article useful and informative. It was one of the few articles that described The Lancet’s peer review process well. The article has a clear explanation that makes it easy to understand.

Reflect: Still, this article is not enough to answer all my questions and will require that I research other sources. Reading multiple sources will help me get a better feel and understanding about The Lancet reputation as well as it’s audience; which was not mentioned in this article.

__________________________

Ridio Skordileva

Annotated Bibliography


Summarize-This article provides us with a check list of what we should do when we peer review. It gives us step by step directions to peer review the right way. I believe this article is perfect because it shows the study’s of what works and what doesn’t.

Assess- This has to be the best article I have found so far to help me better understand the prose of peer review and use that information to find the prose used by The Lancet. I believe this article is reliable seeing that it was done over the course of a few years. From other articles that I have seen this seems to make more scene to me and will help me answer questions for my paper. I don’t see an bias in the article what so ever, making the article even better for my final paper. A paper with no bias towards one side or the other is always a good paper with research and not personal thoughts on the subject.

Reflect- I believe this will fit well in my paper with the key being that it has no bias. The article was very helpful to me, and will help me complete my final paper. I can look at the check list and see if it will compare with what the lancet dose to evaluate the articles they allow on there site. This article has not changed my thoughts on the subject of peer review because I believe it would
be good if everyone had some kind of checklist to follow when peer reviewing paper maybe it would cut down on biases of the reviewers.

Andrew Palmer


Summary: The articles describes how journals use their peer review process to select only the journals with the highest quality. He references the lance by saying there's a bigger difference between their higher quality papers and their low quality papers.

Asses: This article will sort of useful for my paper on the Lancet because .It also gives me more ideas and research topics to search.

Reflect: Morgan gives a good description but brief description on how the quality of a journal will publish effects its credibility and a journal with higher standards will reach more peers because of their better quality.

Andrew Palmer


Summary: This article describes what the *Lancet* plans to do to further prevent plagiarism. In the recent years more technology has been invented to compare txt.
Assess: This article has good, to the point information. Though i wish it was longer, its still a good resource to have for my paper.

Reflect: One good thing about this article is that its very recent. Its also straight from the *Lancet* itself. I think i can use some of this information for my paper.