




Peer Reviewing Manuscripts for PA Journals

Trenton Honda, PhD, PA-C
Editor-in-Chief

Journal of Physician Assistant Education (JPAAE)

Richard Dehn, MPA, PA-C
Editor-in-Chief

Journal of the American Academy of PAs (JAAPA)



Conflict of Interest Disclosure

The presenters have no conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise.

Objectives

The attendees will be able to...

- Describe the purpose of peer review
- Articulate the steps in the peer review process
- Identify the best practices associated with peer reviewing manuscripts for PA journals
- Apply the principles of peer review to a sample article

Agenda for this Session


- Introductions/roles of presenters
- Rationale for peer review
- Steps to complete a manuscript review
- Best practices associated with quality peer reviewing of manuscripts
- Interactive Session: Manuscript review with feedback
 - Clinical Article (JAAPA)
 - Educational/Research Article (JPAE)
- Wrap-up

Documents for this Workshop
(a public Google Drive):

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/17AXGgdzVKEON7etMb8_ttqkJYDlMCBaq?usp=sharing

Documents are also available at the
conference portal

PA Journals



Peer review

“Peer review ... is a process of subjecting an author’s ... work ... to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field.”

– *EJIFCC*. 2014;25(3):227-243.

Peer Review Purpose

- The peer review process often receives criticism and definitely has limitations
 - It still plays a fundamental role in helping to ensure published research is accurate, trustworthy, of importance to the intended audience.
 - It helps ensure content meets the highest standards of research/publication within a given field.

Why serve as a peer reviewer?

This is a fair question as...

- We are all pressed for time
- It is hard work, as you have to engage in serious critical thinking
- There is no financial reward
- You have to deal with editors and deadlines
- You may have to convey unwelcome news

However,...

- It is a professional responsibility
- It will strengthen your critical thinking and writing skills
- It will likely have value for your promotion and tenure

Guidelines and Training for Peer Reviewers

In the *JAAPA* guidelines

- Descriptions of the types of articles accepted
- Length and format requirements
- Instructions for how to prepare and submit the manuscript
- Details on the publishing process

Decisions

- Accept, Revise, Reject
- *The answers to nearly all the questions that would-be authors and reviewers ask:*

www.jaapa.com www.editorialmanager.com/jaapa

<https://journals.lww.com/jaapa/Pages/authorguidelines.aspx>

<http://edmgr.ovid.com/jaapa/accounts/ifaauth.htm>



In the *JPAE* guidelines

- Descriptions of the types of articles accepted
- Length and format requirements
- Instructions for how to prepare and submit the manuscript
- Guidelines for Reviewers
- Rubrics
- Step-by-step instructions for submitting an article or review in Editorial Manager

Decisions

- Accept as is, Minor revision, Major revision, Reject

<https://journals.lww.com/jpae/Pages/informationforauthors.aspx>

<https://www.editorialmanager.com/paea/default.aspx>



JPAE Research Rubric

- Not all study strengths and/or weakness are created equal
- Topic matter experts answer: “so what?”
- Methodological experts answer: “is it valid?”

3 = exceptional, 2 = adequate, 1 = inadequate, IDK= I don't know, NA = not applicable to this study		3	2	1	IDK	NA
Introduction	The research question is set in the context of previous literature					
	The aim is clearly articulated					
Methods	Inclusion and exclusion criteria are clearly articulated					
	The study design is clearly articulated and is appropriate for the question					
	The population of interest, independent variables, and dependent variables are clearly defined					
	Potential covariates are determined from literature and controlled for					
	The measures are clearly described					
	Reliability and validity of instrument(s) addressed (if appropriate)					
	Quality (e.g., convenience vs. truly random sampling) and representativeness of the sample(s)					
	Appropriate statistical methods (qualitative, quantitative, or both) are employed					
	Multivariable analyses where appropriate (control for potential confounding)					
	Sample size/power addressed					
	Plan for missing data and addressed appropriately					
	Selection bias/volunteer bias/survey non-response addressed appropriately in the study design and/or analysis					
Results	Characteristics of the study cohort/sample are reported					
	Tables and figures stand alone (appropriate titles, legends and footnotes) and are referenced in the text					
	Point estimates, test statistics, and <i>p</i> values or confidence intervals are reported where appropriate					
Discussion	Results are positioned within a review of the relevant current literature					
	The importance of the findings and possible explanations of study results are addressed					
	Study strengths are discussed					
	Study limitations are discussed					
	The author's conclusion(s) is/are supported by the method and results, and not overstated					
References	References include relevant, current articles on the topic					

Peer Review Process

Manuscript Review Process

- Editorial Manager (EM) System notifies the Editor in Chief (EIC) that a manuscript has been submitted
- Staff review manuscript and associated document to ensure all material is completed
- EIC reviews manuscript for appropriateness for identified article type
- A manuscript may then be delegated to a special editor before being assigned to peer review
 - Clinical editor, Department editor, Statistical editor

Manuscript Review Process

- An editor will typically assign 2-4 peer reviewers from the EM System or Publons© database.
- Manuscripts may go through multiple stages of revision and resubmission.
- After acceptance, the article is screened by Wolters Kluwer using a plagiarism algorithm.

Manuscript Review Process

- Once all the review are received, the EIC will make a final decision and communicate this to the author(s).
 - Department or section editors may recommend a disposition to EIC
- Reviewers have an opportunity to read the reviews submitted by the other peer reviewers.
- Obtain credit for the review (Category 1 CME; Publons©)

Reviewers may be asked to look at their previously reviewed articles, if revised.

Individual Peer Review Process

- E-mail Invitation to peer review a manuscript
- Decision on whether to review or not (COI?)
- If yes, access web site and manuscript
- Review manuscript
- Submit comments and recommendation
- Obtain credit for your review
- You are notified of the decision by the editor
- You can read the other peer review comments
- You might be asked to peer review revised manuscript.

Elements of a Good Review

- Give the editor some sense of the relative significance of the paper from your perspective.
 - Is the topic of interest to enough readers to warrant publication?
 - Does the paper fit the journal and its audience?
- Documents the paper's strengths and weaknesses.
- Present your opinion of the weaknesses in an objective, constructive tone.
- If the study design is inappropriate, clearly outline why.
- Suggests specific ways to improve the manuscript.

Importance of Confidentiality

- Submissions to journals are confidential!
- The PA and PA education communities are small and well-networked.
- Respect your colleagues by maintaining their confidence.
- Do not contact authors directly to discuss the submission - work through the editor.

Reviewer Comments: Example #1 (Research)

Results Section:

1. Was a second email sent out to the students to increase the return rate of the survey?
2. Develop a table displaying the results
3. Include a breakdown (distribution) of responses by program. Need to demonstrate this for bias and discuss later.
4. What is the female to male ratio of PA students in the state? Include for comparison to results.
5. It is stated that 43.3% of students indicated geriatric clinical exposure or coursework during the second year of school. Geriatric exposure occurs in family practice, internal medicine inpatient and outpatient, etc. Were you surveying for a formal geriatric rotation or general exposure?

Reviewer Comments; Example #2 (Clinical)

1. The General Features section is too long – refocus on content relevant to PA readers, reduce management statements which are better suited for later in paper.
2. Consider re-ordering your Etiologic Factors, starting with the most common
3. Key elements from History are missing (e.g. weight gain/loss, cough, nocturia, exercise intolerance, abdominal distension). Were these assessed?
4. In Diagnostics, the use of cardiac MRI as described here is not consistent with current evidence – revisit this section and consider role of stress testing
5. In Diagnostics, CXR is not defined but an important tool
6. In management, readers would benefit from more discussion of approaches and benefits of restoring NSR
7. Some drugs and surgical interventions may contribute to/worsen HF, but this is not mentioned. Also, no discussion of vaccinations in patients with HF is noted.
8. In Management, numerous standard therapies for treating late state disease are missing from the paper. No studies on ivabradine are mentioned.

Steps in Completing the Review Process

- Initially perform a first read-through (usually a skim read)
- Then consider any major or fatal flaws
- Re-read again, paying closer attention to your initial concerns
- Is the introduction compelling and accurate?
- If applicable, are the methods appropriate?
- If applicable, are the results and discussion appropriate?
- Are the conclusions sound and accurate?
- Are the accessories (images, graphics, tables) helpful and accurate?
- Is there adequate and appropriate referencing?

Interactive Peer Review Exercise

Let's get to work!

Wrap-up

- Let us know how we can help; we invite you as a reviewer!
- ealesbury@paeaonline.org
- Thank you for your contributions to PA journals!
- jaapaeditor@wolterskluwer.com

