How’s your plumbing?
The Reviewer Form – a “simple” requirement

Please enter your comments for the author:
Basic Plumbing

Reviewer Blind Comments to Author

Insert Special Character

Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor

Upload Reviewer Attachments

No Recommendation
- Accept
- Minor Revision
- Major Revision
- Reject

Save & Submit Later

Reviewer Instructions
Please pay careful attention to this reviewer form.
More basic plumbing

- Concatenated
- Anonymized in certain contexts
- Re-opened
- Merged into emails - sometimes
- Edited – but keep the original
- Shared – but only sometimes...

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: More basic plumbing

Reviewer #2: More basic plumbing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rod Randall (Reviewer 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reviewer 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Decision Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But wait.. there are more “simple” requirements

- Yes/no questions
- Follow on questions
- Min/max responses
- Required/optional responses
- Text, integer, date, notes, etc.
.. and remember our journal forms need:

- Radio buttons
- Check boxes
- Drop downs
- Default choices
- Option to allow author access to responses
and rating options...

**Manuscript Rating**

These instructions are customizable by the journal.

The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.

- N/A 1 2 3

The information presented was new.

- N/A 1 2 3 4 5

The conclusions were supported by the data.

- N/A 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Section Category</th>
<th>Manuscript Number</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRIAL25-D-12-00013</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRIAL25-D-12-00014</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRIAL25-D-12-00015</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRIAL25-D-12-00016</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure and report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer First Name</th>
<th>Reviewer Last Name</th>
<th>Reviewer's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>Yes - Add payasage to SPASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>Yes - Don’t add spaso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eile</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Yes - Price of fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Swan</td>
<td>Yes - Food in mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>Yes - Toast and jam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Yes - Aspicadled sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Yes - Aspicadled sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Yes - Aspicadled sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Yes - Aspicadled sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Ferrik</td>
<td>Yes - List a side dish but don’t list unsubsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoba</td>
<td>Abbotson</td>
<td>Yes - Aspicadled sa and aspl and aspl and aspl as aspl and aspl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan</td>
<td>Rodgers</td>
<td>Yes - Aspicadled sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New question: What is the meaning of life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer First Name</th>
<th>Reviewer Last Name</th>
<th>Reviewer's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>Add aspicadled SPASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>Adult as spaso and aspl aspl aspl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eile</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>K. q. o. k. a. k. a. e. l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Aspicadled sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Aspicadled sa and aspl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>No conclusions were supported by the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Ferrik</td>
<td>Aspicadled sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did I mention ....all these options need to be different for different Article Types... (and reviewer roles)...

Form A

Form B

Original Research Article

Special Issue Article
The forms of today are not the forms of tomorrow....

“Agile” software release cycles...

Or something better....

Combine into new or existing forms at any time

Add/edit questions in various formats at any time

Associate with new/existing article types or new/existing reviewer roles at any time
Yawn?
Dynamic Environment

How has the scorecard been validated?

Our scorecard has already gone through several rounds of construction, review, testing and re-construction. Some highlights of the development are listed below, but you will soon be able to download our complete paper on the scorecard development and validation process, as well as a sample. We are currently continuing cycles of testing and feedback, and expect that our Beta Release will provide additional input as we prepare for the final version for our Live Release.

Version 1

- Scorecards from 20 different biomedical journals were analyzed to determine the essential items to include in the evaluation.
- The items were grouped into three sections: Quality of Research, Quality of Presentation, and Scientific Importance (later changed to Novelty and Interest)
- Items (now called subsections) were rated as poor, weak, modest, strong, or very strong.

Version 2

- Descriptors were added to each of the subsections to help calibrate reviewers.
- Impact Assessment condensed into a single Novelty & Interest rating, with 9 levels (poor to exceptional).

Version 3

- After face validation test 1 (internal panel of Managing Reviewers).
- Descriptors rewritten to remove subjective statements and provide a more uniform presentation.
- New format condensed the descriptors into items to be checked for each subsection.

Version 4

- Value categories (poor, good, etc.) were replaced by a visual analog scale (VAS) for ease of use.
- Subsection and section weightings were applied based on revised analysis.

Some journals (especially new open-access journals) may choose to use Rubriq to replace their review process entirely, but this is by no
Reviewer form “portability”

Examples:

Cross journal transfer
“Open” peer review - discussion
What do you need to make a reviewer form portable?

- Solicits agreement from Reviewer
- Ensures appropriate disclosure in XML feed
- Inclusion of ORCID in transfer
Sharing and discussing Reviewer forms
- AKA “open peer review”

Discussion Forum – dynamic sharing and discussion of manuscript and Reviewer forms, with:

Editors
Authors
The World
Tools to help Reviewers

Necessary luxuries
What some journals are doing
Tools to help Reviewers: Access to Similarity Checking
Tools to help Reviewers: Access to ORCID profiles
Tools to help Reviewers:
Bibliography linking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Validation</th>
<th>PubMed</th>
<th>CrossRef</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Tools to help Reviewers: Temporary access to valuable content databases

What's Shibboleth?

Shibboleth is among the world's most widely deployed federated identity solutions, connecting users to applications both within and between organizations. Every software component of the Shibboleth system is free and open source.

Shibboleth is an open-source project that provides Single Sign-On capabilities and allows sites to make informed authorization decisions for individual access of protected online resources in a privacy-preserving manner.
Concluding Remarks
There is a lot of plumbing needed!

There is a lot of baseline functionality needed for a journal workflow systems

- There are thousands of functionality points
- Reporting and measuring
- "Necessary" luxuries
- Configurability

**Workflow System**

- APC Processing
- Email processing
- Etc. x 100
- Reviewer forms
- Reviewer Selection
- Co-author workflows
- Author forms
- File handling
- Funder identification
Summary

- Always available – boring is good
- Investment in maintenance
- A team to respond respond quickly when things go wrong
- Somebody is thinking and investing in new luxuries – standards and APIs applied to solve real “pain points” in a scalable manner
- Workflow no longer “in the basement” – now part of strategic business model
- A “configurable”, “industrial strength” workflow system essential in this new context – The future is exciting!