



## Peer Review; Critical Process of a Scholarly Publication

Received: 19 October 2016 / Published: 31 October 2016

**Keywords:** Editorial, Peer-review, Scholarly Publication



The quality of an article is a critical parameter for the success of any scholarly journal, and the Journal of Modern Materials (JMM) is no exception. Peer review process presents a barrier prior to publication which acts as a quality control filter in science. Typically, the journal editor assigns submitted paper to two or more qualified peers – recognized experts in the relevant field. The reviewers will then submit detailed criticism of the paper along with a recommendation to reject, accept with major revisions, accept with minor revisions, or accept as it is. The quality and consistency of peer review will be the key success for the Journal of Modern Materials.

Peer reviewers generously volunteer to undertake peer review based on their expertise, not based on any expected rewards. They spend their precious time and intellectual energy to evaluate a manuscript that serves as critical function in enhancing the quality of manuscript submitted to the Journal of Modern Materials. The handling editor also reviews each manuscript independently and may add their own comments but he or she relies heavily on reviewer's comment to make an editorial decision and give clear feedback to authors concerning the basis for this decision. Generally, at least two reviewers are invited for each manuscript. Handling editor identify potential reviewers based on the content of the manuscript as well as their experience in working with individual reviewers. Reviewers need to comment in a well-organized manner by identifying the major strengths and weaknesses of a manuscript. If a revised manuscript is requested, which is often the case, reviewers should provide clear, detailed suggestions for specific changes to improve the clarity of writing and the quality of the scientific contribution to the field of Materials Science. This is not an easy task as reviewers need to evaluate and communicate them clearly and in detail, sometimes by including examples and references to specific text so that authors can best

understand and take benefit from reviewer's feedback. Authors should not be invited to revise manuscripts that will not contribute significantly to the field of materials science. For this decision, reviewers should identify major problems with materials, methods, or significance that are not feasible to correct and distinguish them from correctable problems.

I strongly encourage reviewers to be honest in their assessment of a manuscript as the constructiveness of reviewer's suggestion plays an important role in improving the quality of the manuscript, the science, and significance in the field of materials science. Reviewers also have the option for providing confidential comments to the editor that are not seen by the authors. Reviewers should keep in mind that the formatting style of manuscript will be managed by the copy editor and need not be a focus of the review.

Handling editor generally ask authors to respond to each of the points that are made by reviewers unless they are contradictory (in such case the editor will provide guidance to resolve contradictory points). It is not uncommon to encounter with disagreements among reviewers about the quality of a manuscript and the nature of its contribution to the field. The final editorial



decision for a manuscript reflects the handling editor's overall judgment about the quality of the manuscript and an editor's opinion will sometimes reflect a minority opinion among reviewers.

Sometimes peer review process barred editor to take prompt decision as it depends upon reviewer's responsiveness at all phases of the review process. The timeliness of reviewer's comment is very much valued and appreciated by editors as well as authors. Thanks for the responsiveness of the reviewers and editors belong to Journal of Modern Materials. It's not uncommon of such a difficult occasion when a review assignment comes and cannot be accepted. However, if you need to decline a review request, we ask you to let us know as soon as possible so that we can invite other reviewers. Delays in acceptance or decline of a review prolong the editorial process and create uncertainty among

handling editors about whether to invite another reviewer or not. Even if you have already accepted the reviewing assignment and later realized that you are going to be late with that review, or cannot complete it, kindly let the editor know as soon as possible as well. Such prompt notification is very much appreciated as it facilitates the efficient management of reviews and editorial work flow.

Manuscripts are to be treated as privileged and confidential communications that are seen by reviewers and editors who participate in a review process. Reviewers have the primary ethical responsibility to recognize conflicts of interest and to excuse themselves from a review if they feel that bias could interfere with an independent review. Moreover, authors should declare known conflicts with editors and reviewers who are close colleagues and who have a conferred interest in the submitted research work.

We are very interested in identifying reviewers who would like to serve for the Journal of Modern Materials. If you are a reviewer who has been reviewing for the Journal of Modern Materials, enjoy it, and if you want to take responsibility for reviews you might consider applying to join either the reviewer board (less-experienced reviewer) or the editorial board (more experienced reviewer). If you want to be considered for either of these positions in the future, please contact us.

October 2016

Dr. Adam A. Bahishti  
Editor,  
Journal of Modern Materials

### **How to Cite this Article:**

A. Bahishti, "Peer Review; Critical Process of a Scholarly Publication", *J. Mod. Mater.*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 1.1-1.2, Oct. 2016. doi: [10.21467/jmm.2.1.1.1-1.2](https://doi.org/10.21467/jmm.2.1.1.1-1.2)