

JEAMS

PEER REVIEW

The information provided in this document is subject to change without notice. Information may be changed or updated without notice.

VALUE OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

While there are many complaints about the peer review system, there is no acceptable alternative. Three major complaints by journalists are the failure of peer reviewers to detect academic dishonesty, the slow publication process, and the expense to authors. Until journalists and other online anonymous haters offer a feasible solution, no journal should be blamed for charging fees (government funding only supports the research, not the publication), taking time to vet the science (which detects most poorly designed research) and to edit the writing (a labor intensive and costly process).

While authors are welcome to self-publish on preprint servers to escape proofreading, editing, peer review, and fees, self-publishing continues to fail to obtain the credibility of the rigorous peer review and editorial processes practiced by commercial publishers. Predatory journals can publish quickly, but typically charge high fees to the authors.

The need for some authors to publish immediately is a curious phenomenon. Rarely do competitors beat authors to the press by days or weeks. There are no research findings that actually must be published so quickly that the entire publishing process should be circumvented. Even within biomedical sciences, there doesn't exist even one instance of a life or death situation where immediate publication of a putative cure or treatment was required.

JEAMS BELIEVES IN PEER REVIEW

Every manuscript type undergoes the peer review process at JEAMS. Even the technical information contained in one page columns will be peer reviewed at the discretion of the editors. In selecting peer reviewers, JEAMS bases the choices on various factors such as expertise, reputation, referrals, availability, and commitment to review subsequent revisions. Authors are welcome to suggest individuals and laboratories as potential peer reviewers.

The manuscript, supplementary information (SI), etc. are provided as confidential materials to at least one (but ideally two or three) peer reviewers. If a peer reviewer lacks access to some of the literature cited in a submitted manuscript, JEAMS will consider paying any necessary fees to obtain the published paper. Consequently, peer reviewers would work via our secure online journal management system. A sample link and password is provided below, where a unique website is created for each submission.

www.20170313.eamhonorsociety.org

Username = pretend_peer

Password = 2017March13

INSTRUCTIONS TO PEER REVIEWERS

Peer reviewers don't decide whether a manuscript is rejected or not, but provide information to the editors for that decision as well as provide feedback to the author to improve a manuscript into an acceptable form, if possible. A submission should meet four general criteria for publication in JEAMS: 1) valid and scientifically sound research; 2) conclusions supported by strong evidence from a properly designed experiment; 3) representing an important advance in the specific field; and 4) interesting to subscribers. Peer reviewers are specifically asked for their technical criticisms on proper experimental design, quality of data collection, robust statistical analysis, valid data interpretation, originality and significance of conclusions, proper references of the literature, etc.. Additionally, peer reviewers are asked to suggest improvements for revisions.

OVERVIEW OF OUR PEER REVIEW PROCESS

In the first month after our official acknowledgment of a manuscript submission, our initial editorial review then an anonymous open / double-blind peer review by the EAM community and external experts would be completed by a preset deadline. If the peer review process isn't completed by the end of that first month, an automatic decision to approve would be forwarded to the editorial staff. In the second month, our copyediting / proofreading / statistical review would be conducted, and final changes allowed. In the third month, our issue would be sent off to the printers then bulk mailed to our subscribers.

Regarding transparency and fairness of our peer review process, the identities of the author and peer reviewers would initially be kept anonymous (double-blind review). Ultimately on a case-by-case basis, the identities of the peer reviewers would be disclosed to the author, and the peer reviewers would be given publication credit by listing their names on the published paper.