

Guidance for Peer Reviewers for ASEE Engineering Libraries Division

This document discusses guidelines related to how an Engineering Libraries Division reviewer should provide peer review for a manuscript for the ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition.

Instructions for the rudimentary tasks in the review process, like how to interact with the ASEE paper management system of choice, are covered in the ASEE Reviewer Instructions issued by ASEE for the current conference. An example of these ASEE Reviewer Instructions for the 2016 Annual Conference and Exhibition is available at:

https://www.asee.org/documents/conferences/annual/2016/2016_Reviewer_Instructions.pdf

This document provides the manuscript reviewer with guidance to ensure that the following objectives are met during our peer review:

1. That authors receive a thorough review of their work that includes constructive feedback, if needed.
2. That the papers presented by the ELD at the ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition meet expectations for quality at a national conference.

Who Reviews?

Peer reviewers shall be members in good standing of the Engineering Libraries Division. The Publication Committee Chair will invite members to serve as peer reviewers for the conference.

If invited, members are expected to:

- Respond in a reasonable time to let the Chair know if they are able/unable to review
- Review a small set (3-4 papers) of manuscripts
- Declare any manuscripts they may have submitted for the Conference, to ensure that they are not assigned their own papers for review
- Contact the Chair if review of a particular manuscript would constitute a conflict of interest
- Complete reviews within the timeframe required by ASEE for the conference

Guidance for the Review

During the review, reviewers should:

- Refrain from discussing manuscripts or involving others in the review (with the exception of the Program/Publications Chairs, who may be consulted at any time)
- Read manuscripts thoroughly
- Contact Publications Chair if any concerns are raised on ethical grounds about the manuscript - these discussions/inquiries shall be confidential

In preparing review comments, reviewers should:

- Be objective and constructive, providing information that will help manuscript authors to improve their paper. From the Wiley guidelines, the following statement is helpful: "Avoid

one-liners...Every reviewer should adequately explain or support their judgement.” (cf. <https://www.google.com/url?q=http://olabout.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-828100.html&sa=D&ust=1473172560342000&usq=AFQjCNEolt-Bi7TUMYxt6mviuCWgJMKs1A>)

- Exercise judgement of the manuscript quality in accord with the expected level of scholarly discourse for practicing, professional engineering librarians that reflects a respect for the diversity of librarian appointments (i.e. tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, academic staff, etc.)
- Avoid commentary that could be perceived as derogatory
- Be as specific as possible in any criticisms, referring to exact locations in the manuscript and providing a clear and fair evaluation
- Not attempt to re-write/revise the manuscript according to the reviewer’s writing style - Be respectful of the writing style of the manuscript author
- Review with the understanding that, even among engineering librarians, manuscript authors have diverse communication skills and abilities within written English, and provide any feedback in this regard with due respect
- Ensure that any comments to the manuscript’s author are consistent with any reviewer comments left for the Program/Publications Chairs in the paper management system
- Not suggest addition of references/citations of works to the manuscript that are intended primarily to increase the citations of the reviewer’s (or a reviewer’s associate’s) work. However, if the reviewer finds that an area of literature has not been reviewed adequately, a generic peer-review statement like, “There is literature on [Topic X] that you should investigate for possible inclusion in your literature review, and cite appropriately,” is greatly appreciated.

After the Review

Post-review, reviewers should:

- Keep details of the manuscript and its review confidential
- Respond promptly to any additional requests regarding the review from the Program/Publications Chairs.
- If manuscripts are reviewed as being accepted with changes, be prepared to conduct a quick second review of the manuscript after the author has had a chance to address the changes requested

These guidelines are largely drawn from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) document, “[COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](http://publicationethics.org/).” COPE is “...a forum for editors and publishers of peer reviewed journals to discuss all aspects of publication ethics.” For more information on COPE, please visit their website <http://publicationethics.org/>