

Updated Guidance for *PRS* Reviewers- June 2022

Overview of recommendations

- **“Reject”** – Rejection should be recommended if you believe a manuscript is unsuitable for *PRS* and cannot be made suitable with revisions.
- **“Major Revision”** – Major revision should be recommended if you believe a manuscript requires extensive corrections and revisions (thoroughly made and carefully re-reviewed) to be made suitable for *PRS*.
- **“Minor Revision”** – Minor revision should be recommended if you have revision requests that will enhance or clarify a manuscript without requiring the authors to extensively rewrite the paper or rework the study (i.e., no fundamental flaws).
- **“Accept”** – Acceptance should be recommended if all previous requests have been thoroughly and adequately addressed and if no further revisions are needed. Acceptance should not be recommended in the first round of review.

Note:

Recommendations should largely correspond to the ranking of each submission (“Below Top 20%; unsuitable”, “Top 10-20%; ok if materials are needed”, or “Top 10%; must publish”). For example, you should not recommend that a paper be accepted if you have ranked it below the top 20% of papers you’ve reviewed. You could, however, recommend “Major Revision” for a paper that you rank as “Top 10%; must publish;” this combination of ranking and recommendation tells the Editor-in-Chief or designate that the paper should be published in *PRS* if the authors can make the requested and required revisions.

Guidance for reviewer comments

Reviewer comments should offer thoughtful, constructive feedback to authors as well as aid the Editor-in-Chief in making a final decision for each manuscript. *PRS* reviewers are expected to follow the **“Peer Reviewer Golden Rule”**: **“Review unto others as you would have them review unto you.”**

Peer reviewing for *PRS* is an opportunity to provide guidance and mentorship to authors, whether their manuscript is eventually published in *PRS* or in another journal entirely.

The reviewer form prompts reviewers to provide comments in two separate fields: Comments to the Authors and Confidential Comments to the Editor.

There are different purposes and expectations for each of these comment fields, as outlined below:

Comments to the Authors:

- Comments to the authors are **required**.
 - If requesting revisions, concrete guidance to the authors is necessary to help them improve their paper.
 - If recommending rejection, feedback is necessary to explain your concerns and support the Editor's final decision for the paper.
 - Specificity is key.
 - Examples:
 - If you think there are too many figures, let the authors know *which* figures should be removed in your view (rather than simply stating that some figures should be removed).
 - If you believe the conclusions of a study are unjustified, provide concrete critiques for why they are unjustified and/or how they should be amended (rather than simply stating that the conclusions are unjustified).
- Comments to the authors should remain neutral.
 - Please provide meaningful, constructive comments and critiques that will help the authors improve their paper. Inflammatory, insulting comments are not allowed.
 - Likewise, please refrain from offering overt praise, enthusiasm, or congratulations to the authors directly. Such comments to the author will be removed. If you are enthusiastic about a paper and believe it should be published, please let the Editor know in your confidential comments.
- Comments should critique the merits of the study itself.
 - Minor formatting or copyediting issues need not be addressed in your review, as the publisher and society both have personnel dedicated to copyediting and proofreading the text.
 - Two **exceptions**:
 - If the entire manuscript needs to be revised by a native English speaker, please alert the Editor and/or in your reviewer comments.
 - If a figure (particularly a graphic or graph) has misspelled words or non-American spelling standards, please alert the authors.

Confidential Comments to the Editor:

- Comments to the Editor should support and justify the recommendation you've made for a manuscript.
 - These comments can be candid and informal.
 - Provide 2-3 quick reasons to justify your selected recommendation (i.e., why you think a paper should be rejected, accepted, or revised/re-reviewed for *PRS*).
- Utilize confidential comments to let the Editor know if:
 - You have major concerns regarding the ethics or integrity of a manuscript.
 - Be on the look out for salami slicing or duplication of publication when similar studies have been published in the past by the same authors or is pending publication
 - You feel a manuscript would be a better fit for a different journal.
 - You feel a manuscript may be better suited for *PRS* under a different article type.
- If you believe a manuscript would benefit from a discussion if published, let the Editor know who you'd recommend as a discussant.

New things we'd like reviewers to look for

Please alert the Editor and/or ask the authors to revise these items in your review:

- Priority claims
 - Studies should not claim to be the "first" or "largest" of its kind.
- Titles that are unprofessional or hyperbolic.
- Professionalism of photographs
 - In addition to existing requests to judge the appropriateness, value, and quality of a figure, we ask that you also provide feedback on the professionalism of figures, in particular photographs:
 - The background should not be cluttered or have inappropriate imagery.
 - The operative field or substrate should not be "messy."
 - The authors may or may not be able to provide updated figures; can the article be acceptable *without* this figure?

New guidelines for I&Is

Our [Instructions for Authors](#) have been updated to reflect Dr. Chung's new vision for Ideas & Innovations manuscripts; this means that reviewer feedback/requests for I&Is should also reflect these simplified, structured guidelines.

When reviewing I&I submissions, please keep in mind these specific guidelines:

- Ideas & Innovations submissions should capture the essence of the work in a short, simplified manner.
- Manuscripts should be framed in a way that summarizes the authors' experience and directly highlights the pearls they wish to share with readers.
- Ideas and Innovations should not be perceived as an avenue for "miniature Original Articles." They should not focus on a scientific hypothesis or formal analysis but can include demographic and outcomes data if needed.
- Rather than conforming to the standard format of a scientific paper (e.g., traditional sections such as "materials and methods"), Ideas & Innovations submissions should follow the templated outline below:

I. Summary/Unstructured Abstract (250 words)

- A brief summary should be included in lieu of a formal abstract.

II. Concise Presentation of Unique Idea, Innovation, or Technique

- This section should focus on the "What" of the article.
- There is latitude in how this section is titled.
- Subheadings/subsections are not allowed.

III. Discussion

- This section should answer the "Why" of the article.
- It should address the importance or relevance of the idea, innovation, or technique.