

Ahmad Bilal¹

Received: 29 June 2022; Accepted: 29 June 2022

¹Chief Editor, Journal of Professional & Applied Psychology (JPAP), Pakistan.

Corresponding Author Email:
ceditor@iprpk.com

Peer reviewing is an integral part of academic journey. The importance of academic reviewing can not be understated in the field of academic publishing. An academic reviewer is often known as peer reviewer among a cluster of researchers. It is the contribution of academic reviewers that excel the process of scientific discovery and make the knowledge progress. The former editor of a well reputed journal noted, “Democracy and academic reviewing have something in common: it is a system full of problems but the least worst we have” (Wingfield, 2018). The aim of the academic review is to evaluate a scientific research paper for both its content and quality. An academic reviewer helps the publishing process forward.

In Pakistan, there has been a significant rise in academic and scientific writing. It owes to the impact of global rankings and policies framed by Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC) for the promotion to higher ranks in a university. Unfortunately, this has only resulted in the production of mere research papers for the sake of getting benefits associated with academic publishing. There is a direct proportion between the number of academic authors and academic reviewers. The more a journal gets scientific papers, the more it needs academic reviewers to evaluate the content and quality

of the scientific papers. Ironically, most of the academia do not consider academic reviewing a compulsory part of their academic activities and consider it as a casual, bothersome, and a formality for publication (Mansoor, 2021). The effectiveness of academic reviewing can be enhanced by framing a reward policy for academic reviewers by the HEC.

The Editorial Staff of an academic journal has to work very hard to find relevant, specialist, and seasoned peer reviewers for evaluation of papers submitted in the journal. Only a handful of peer reviewers do have interest and passion for review process or take it as a sacred duty towards scientific advancement (Jawaid et al., 2006). On the other hand, some reviewers do not take the process seriously and forward the paper to a junior colleague for the task (Mansoor, 2021). The whole process of peer review and scientific publishing becomes shaky by such practices. The job of the Editorial Staff becomes even more daunting when a reviewer does not submit the review in the given time frame even if he/she has committed to do so.

The Journal of Professional & Applied Psychology (JPAP) uses journal management system developed by Simon Fraser University under the Public Knowledge Project (PKP) which is commonly known as Open Journal Systems (OJS). The submission of a paper and its peer review process are handled through OJS. The JPAP follows the double blind continuous peer review process where the authors revise the papers until the reviewers gives recommendation of Acceptance of a paper.

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial 4.0 License (<http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits non-Commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified.

© Copyright: The Authors (2022)

The Editorial Staff do not finalize a paper without the formal Accept recommendation of a reviewer. Even some revised papers do get rejected because of Reject recommendation of reviewers.

It has been noted that some reviewers are novice to OJS and are not conversant with computer use. Such reviewers either take a long time to respond or respond through emails which increases the pressure on the Editorial Staff to make the process smooth for all including authors and journal editorial board.

The training of novice reviewers is a good idea to improve the quality of the review process and to make it standardized for all reviewed papers (Jawaid et al., 2006; Rathore & Farooq, 2018). The purpose of review, guidelines for quality review, importance of deadlines and its impact on authors publications, and submission of review through OJS can be taught during training (Janke et al., 2017).

Maqbool (2002) and Miller et al. (2013) has outlined few tips for writing a quality review which are listed below:

- The more you read, more you become a quality reviewer.
- Seek help from other reviewers where necessary. You may contact journal Editorial Staff if need help regarding using OJS.
- Learn peer review process. Get training, follow journal guidelines and respect deadlines.
- Allocate some quality time only for peer review process.
- Maintain confidentiality of the papers.
- Remain bias free. Be constructive, fair and specific in your comments.
- Think of journal's Editorial Staff and authors while writing review.
- Follow the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Guidelines for reviewers.

The peer review task is solely a scientific, professional and dedicated task commensurate with the improvement in the overall publication process. In fact, the peer reviewers are right hand of the Editorial Staff of the journal. Without peer reviewers input, journal can not finalize and publish quality content. The peer reviewers should be acknowledged for their efforts, time, and commitment that helps a journal publish its work (Jawaid, 2014; Menon & Muraleedharan, 2016). The Journal of Professional & Applied Psychology has partnered with Reviewer Credits which is an online platform for the recognition of peer review activity. Moreover, the JPAP offers discount in Article Publication Charges (APC) to its esteemed reviewers to acknowledge their continuous participation in this scientific endeavor. More such incentives need to be set in place for improving and motivating the peer review process.

Contribution of Author

Ahmad Bilal: Conceptualization, Writing-Original draft, Writing - Reviewing & Editing

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest declared by the author.

Source of Funding

The author declared no source of funding.

References

- Janke, K. K., Bzowycykj, A. S., & Traynor, A. P. (2017). Editors' perspectives on enhancing manuscript quality and editorial decisions through peer review and reviewer development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 81, 73. doi: 10.5688/ajpe81473
- Jawaid, S. A. (2014). How to find, grow and retain Good Reviewers: An experience from Pakistan.

- International Journal of Information Science and Management (IJISM)* Special Issue, 7-11.
- Jawaid, S. A., Jawaid, M., & Jafary, M. H. (2006). Characteristics of reviewers and quality of reviews: a retrospective study of reviewers at Pakistan journal of medical sciences. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 22, 101-6.
- Mansoor, S. N. (2021). Peer Review in Pakistan: The Reviewer's Predicament. *Journal of Pakistan Medical Association*, 71 (11), 2492-2494.
- Maqbool, H. (2002). Proceedings of workshop on peer review system held at Karachi and Lahore. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 8, 328-333.
- Menon, V., & Muraleedharan, A. (2016). Credit and visibility for peer reviewing: An overlooked aspect of scholarly publication. *Journal of Neuroscience in Rural Practice*, 7, 330-331.
- Miller, B., Pevehouse, J., Rogowski, R., Tingley, D., & Wilson, R. (2013). How to be a peer reviewer: A guide for recent and soon-to-be PhDs: *Political Science & Politics*, 46, 120-3.
- Rathore, F. A., & Farooq, F. (2018). The Need for Formal Training in the Peer Review Process and Role of Publons Academy. *Journal of College of Physicians & Surgeons of Pakistan*, 28, 78-79.
- Wingfield, B. (2018, September 20). The peer review system has flaws. But it's still a barrier to bad science. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/the-peer-review-system-has-flaws-but-its-still-a-barrier-to-bad-science-84223>