

**EDITORS' ROUNDTABLE  
OTTAWA, ON, CANADA  
OCTOBER 25, 2011**

**Breakout Session on Peer Review**

*Notes of reporting by Author, Reviewer, and Editor groups:  
What steps could be taken to improve the peer review process for each of these groups?*

**AUTHORS**

- Receiving detailed, constructive feedback, and using technology to enhance the feedback process
- More timely reviews and decisions
- Facilitating dissemination and impact; better distribution [not really sure what this refers to – can anyone who was in this group elaborate? -- BG]
- Help with understanding the legal terms of engagement [does this refer to copyright and pub ethics issues? –BG]
- Language [does this refer to having peer review reports and S1M site available in authors' native languages? –BG]

**REVIEWERS**

- Improve the matching of topic of paper with reviewer area of expertise
- Better recognition for reviewers' efforts, especially of genuinely outstanding reviews
- More training, guidance, and evaluation, e.g., information on how to review papers
- Giving academic credit for performing this work

**EDITORS**

- Publishers conducting better marketing to attract the right authors in the first place
- Send manuscripts to more reviewers at the beginning to increase likelihood of getting the required number of reports
- Editors should take a more personal approach to their interactions with reviewers
- Use current reviewers to help grow the list of potential reviewers (ask for names)
- Have a strict "front door policy": reject inappropriate or low-quality submissions before sending to reviewers
- Allow reminders (to reviewers about review that are due) to keep going out for longer (they may stop going out now after the review due date) and send personal reminders
- Maintain reviewer engagement by reporting back to them after a review is complete, sharing the other reviews you received for the paper, letting the reviewers know the ultimate outcome of the review, and sending personal thank you notes to reviewers