Perspectives from perspectives

Peer review and biomedical editing training initiative for PhD Students

QUEST Seminar on Responsible Research
Dec 6th, 2022

Toivo Glatz
toivo.glatz@charite.de
Potential conflicts of interest

- I am passionate about improving peer review and training for doctoral students.
- I received funding from a SPOKES Wellcome Trust Funded Translational Partnership Fellowship via the QUEST Center of the Berlin Institute of Health (2020-21).
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Peer Review
Why bother? I

- The scientific system hinges on peer reviews and peer reviewers
- Editors report that they struggle to find qualified reviewers
- A fair share of review reports are not useful (lacking methodological expertise, demeaning language, unclear or unconstructive requests)
- 77% of 170,000 researchers expressed interest in review training
- How to conduct high quality peer review is notoriously absent from academic curricula at the PhD level
Why bother? II

- Benefits of serving as a peer reviewer
  - Having influence on improving evidence body & research methods
  - Staying up to date with literature
  - Improving your own writing
  - Recognition for your contribution, etc.

- Importance to involve early career researchers in editorial processes
Is it in our job descriptions?

➔ How many peer reviews have you done (ever / this year)?
➔ How much time do you spend performing peer review?
➔ How much time do others spend peer reviewing you?
A billion-dollar donation: estimating the cost of researchers’ time spent on peer review

Balázs Aczel1, Barnabás Szász1 and Alex O. Holcombe2

Abstract
Background: The amount and value of researchers’ peer review work is critical for academia and journal publishing. However, this labor is under-recognized, its magnitude is unknown, and alternative ways of organizing peer review labor are rarely considered.

Methods: Using publicly available data, we provide an estimate of researchers’ time and the salary-based contribution to the journal peer review system.

Results: We found that the total time reviewers globally worked on peer reviews was over 100 million hours in 2020, equivalent to over 15 thousand years. The estimated monetary value of the time US-based reviewers spent on reviews was over 1.5 billion USD in 2020. For China-based reviewers, the estimate is over 600 million USD, and for UK-based, close to 400 million USD.

Conclusions: By design, our results are very likely to be under-estimates as they reflect only a portion of the total number of journals worldwide. The numbers highlight the enormous amount of work and time that researchers provide to the publication system, and the importance of considering alternative ways of structuring, and paying for, peer review. We foster this process by discussing some alternative models that aim to boost the benefits of peer review, thus improving its cost-benefit ratio.
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What might improve the quality of peer reviews?

- No one really knows... evidence-base is sparse!
  - Training?
  - More careful selection of reviewers?
  - Feedback on performance (e.g. review reviewed by editors)?
  - Learning from or supervision by other more experience reviewers?
  - Better incentives? (e.g. credit & acknowledgement, published reviews, €/$, Publons)
  - Greater accountability? (open & public review)
  - Protected time? (e.g. 10% of work time)
What might improve the quality of peer reviews?

- “Live” ongoing interaction between reviewers and authors?
- Post-publication review & other “modern” variants?
- Involvement of early-career researchers?
- Automation of some tasks (e.g. AI to check for plagiarism, competing interests, manuscript allocation)?
- Formally recognize/incentivize reviews as valuable academic output that requires substantial time investment to perform well
2) Our idea

Content based on:
- Personal experience, discussions with many colleagues
- *The BMJ* Reviewer training materials, experience from *The BMJ*
- *Science Editors’ Handbook*
- Scientific publications, commentaries and opinion pieces about peer review
Purpose & method

Provide modern training and insights into the structure, purpose, and conduct of the peer review and editing processes.

Training includes a series of instructive lectures and mentor-guided small group workshops providing hands-on experience in reviewing and editing submitted research papers.
Course Structure and Overview

I. Pre-Course Assignment
Independently completed peer-review assignment mirroring real-world conditions

II. Lectures
Four mandatory, interactive lectures held over Zoom with take-home assignments

III. Workshops
Four mandatory, hands-on workshops led by one editor-mentor; collaborative peer review report preparation

IV. Post-Course Assignment
Independently completed peer-review assignment mirroring real-world conditions
I. Lectures: Format

- 4x à 3 hours (with breaks)
- On Zoom, includes interactive polls, discussions & take-home assignments
What we cover /1

➔ Role of scientific journals, editors, peer reviewers and authors in scientific publishing system

➔ What we know about peer review:
  ◆ History & practice
  ◆ Types
  ◆ Criticism
  ◆ Biases
  ◆ Existing evidence about peer review
What we cover /2

➔ “Good” vs. “bad” peer review reports
➔ Sex and gender aspects
➔ COPE Guidelines
➔ Open science
➔ Modern/non-traditional review structures
➔ Approaching a manuscript to be reviewed:
  ◆ Live step-by-step “walk-through”
➔ The BMJ manuscript meeting listen in
II. Workshops: Format

➔ Small groups will be assigned
  ◆ 1 editor-mentor + 4 trainees
➔ 4 suitable “live” BMJ manuscripts will be assigned to the group
  ◆ The PDF of each manuscript will be uploaded to a specifically prepared, secured channel in PaperHive
  ◆ One trainee will take the lead for each manuscript; all trainees will draft preliminary peer review report together
➔ Small group will meet to discuss article & finalize review report prior to submission to the journal (open review, all group members named)
➔ Mentor will circulate final journal decision
Peerspectives course as a didactic vehicle:

- to train good methods practice & reporting
- to give students credit
- to make real, meaningful contributions
- to meet (ECR) mentors & network with other (international) students
Scientific course evaluation
Scientific course evaluation

➔ 4 cohorts of 16-24 students (N = 80) in a pre-post design

◆ Review quality assessment
  ● Peer review assignment, based on an actual manuscript submitted to our partner journal, under real world conditions with a firm deadline and ability to use all available resources

◆ Review knowledge/skills self assessment
  ● By means of an 8-question online survey to self-assess their own levels of peer review knowledge and relevant skills before the start as well as after the conclusion of the course.

➔ Pre-registration: Available at https://osf.io/vndcx
## Study sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N = 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Range)</td>
<td>30.2 (22 - 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>60 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>20 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performed peer review in the past</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of peer reviews performed (if any)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (Range)</td>
<td>2 (1 - 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Self assessment: Results

**Statement**  
(1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Pre (mean)</th>
<th>Post (mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to peer-review scientific manuscripts</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of what is expected from a reviewer</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to look for in a manuscript when conducting a peer-review</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident and comfortable using reporting guidelines</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of ethical aspects relevant in peer review</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in formulating constructive and clear scientific critique</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my own scientific writing abilities</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of key sex- and gender-related considerations relevant for peer review</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Take home: significant increase for all questions
Self assessment: Prelim. results
Course Feedback

From participants:

➔ “This course helped me to deepen my knowledge of critically reviewing a scientific manuscript which, I believe, will certainly help me to improve the quality of my own research papers in the future”

➔ “... one of the courses which I benefited from the most with regard to future tasks in the field of research”

From our journal partner:

➔ Dr. Elizabeth Loder: “The Peerspectives program has been valuable to The BMJ editors”

➔ Dr. Joseph Ross: “The Peerspectives peer reviews have been terrific”
Next steps

➔ Complete and publish course evaluation research study
  ◆ Editor ratings on the quality of students peer review reports
  ◆ Compare our students review quality to actual BMJ reviewers

➔ Publish open-source train-the-trainer materials so that other groups and institutions can offer the course and adapt it to their needs

➔ Find and secure sustainable funding to keep offering the course at Charité without donating our own research time/$$$

➔ “Editorspectives”!? (you heard it here first!)
It takes a village...

Lecturers
Tobias Kurth
Toivo Glatz
Jess Rohmann

Course Coordination
Nadja Wülk
Hannah Grillmaier
Iman Abdikarim
Mariana Lopes Simoes

Sex/Gender Aspects Expert
Antoinette Maassen van den Brink (Rotterdam)

Expert editor-mentors
Susanne Breitner-Busch (Munich)
Ralph Brinks (Witten/Herdecke)
Kristina Fišter (Zagreb)
Lars Hemkens (Basel)
André Karch (University of Münster)
H. Georg Kuhn (Gothenburg)
Mariska Leeflang (Amsterdam)
Rutger Middelburg (Leiden)
Maarten van Smeden (Utrecht)
Bob Siegerink (Leiden)
& ... still growing!

The BMJ, Editors
Tim Feeney
Elizabeth Loder
Tiago Villanueva
Wim Weber

BIH QUEST Fellowship (£)
SPOKES
Prospective students, editor-mentors & journal partners: Get in touch!

→ OSF: https://osf.io/wyegc
→ peerspectives@charite.de
→ Course registration for SS2023 in February: https://iph.charite.de/en/academic_programs/phd_in_health_data_sciences/peerspectives/
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