

Reviewing papers

kbroman.org/BMI883

Karl Broman
kbroman.org

Review content

- ▶ Is it interesting/important?
- ▶ Is it correct?
- ▶ Is it understandable?
- ▶ How could it be improved?
 - necessary vs recommended changes

Mechanics

▶ Comments to the authors

- No mention of recommendation
- Paragraph describing the work
- Paragraph summarizing review
- Separate major and minor points
- Don't leave anything out
- Point to specific examples from the text
- Authors do things differently than you; **does it matter?**
- Use the “sandwich” method for constructive criticism

▶ Comments to the editor

- Recommendation: accept, minor revisions, major revisions, reject
- Summary of criticism, but no need to repeat
- (vent a bit?)

Questions

- ▶ Why review papers?
- ▶ Who is the reviewer working for?
- ▶ Should reviews be open?
- ▶ Should reviews be non-anonymous?