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1. Survey methodology
2. Ideal world & real world objectives
3. Ethical concerns
4. Timing discrepancies
5. Communicating peer review times
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Make-up of Taylor & Francis authors:

1. STM
2. HSS

Make-up of all authors worldwide:

1. STM
2. HSS

Survey
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Survey Methodology

43,000 Science Technology Medicine

43,000 Humanities & Social Sciences
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Survey Methodology
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2,398 STM responses
4,750 HSS responses
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Survey Methodology

All survey respondents:

2,398 STM responses
Confidence Interval: 1.95%
Confidence Level: 95%

4,750 HSS responses
Confidence Interval: 1.34%
Confidence Level: 95%
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2% confidence interval at 95% confidence level for the population of all 2013 published authors

Survey Methodology

Result

-2% +2%
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Survey Methodology

All survey respondents:

STM
- Authors: 21%
- Reviewers: 16%
- Editors: 63%

HSS
- Authors: 18%
- Reviewers: 18%
- Editors: 63%
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In an **ideal world**...

...to what extent do you agree or disagree the following objectives **should be** the purpose of peer review?

1 2 3 4 5

Ideal world

*vs.*

*real world*
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In an **ideal world**...

...to what extent do you agree or disagree the following objectives **should be** the purpose of peer review?

- Detect plagiarism
- Detect fraud
- Check factual accuracy
- Relevant to scope
- Judge novelty
- Provide polite feedback
- Check methodology

Ideal World – rating out of 10
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Ideal world vs. real world
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HSS
In the **real world**…

...to what extent do you agree or disagree that peer review is currently achieving the following objectives effectively?

**Ideal world** vs. **real world**

![Graph showing comparison between Ideal World and Real World ratings](chart.png)
In the real world...

...to what extent do you agree or disagree that peer review is currently achieving the following objectives effectively?

- Check methodology
- Provide polite feedback
- Judge novelty
- Relevant to scope
- Check factual accuracy
- Detect fraud
- Detect plagiarism

Ideal World – rating out of 10

Real World – rating out of 10
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In the real world...

...to what extent do you agree or disagree that peer review is currently achieving the following objectives effectively?

Ideal world vs. real world
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Ideal world vs. real world
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Detect plagiarism

Ideal world mean score
Real world mean score

Ideal world vs. real world
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Ideal world vs. real world
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Ideal world vs. real world
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Ideal world

vs.

real world

Correct spelling, punctuation & grammar

Ideal world mean score

Real world mean score
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Most important objective...

- Improve quality of published paper
- Expectation exceeds reality...
  - Politeness
  - Detect Fraud
- Expectation matches reality...
  - Relevant to the Aims & Scope
- Reality exceeds expectation...
  - Correcting Spelling, Punctuation & Grammar

Ideal world vs. real world
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How common are the following situations in peer review?

- Gender bias
- Regional bias
- Seniority bias
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How common are the following situations in peer review?

- Gender bias
- Regional bias
- Seniority bias
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How common are the following situations in peer review?

1. Gender bias
2. Regional bias
3. Seniority bias

Ethics in peer review
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How common are the following situations in peer review?

1. Reviewers delay assessment
2. Reviewers take ideas
3. Reviewers use false identities

Ethics in peer review
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Lower frequency of occurrences reported

Higher frequency of occurrences reported

Ethics in peer review

@TandFEditors
#TandFEditors
Peer review in 2015
A Taylor & Francis white paper

Lower frequency of occurrences reported

Higher frequency of occurrences reported
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Ethics in peer review

Lower frequency of occurrences reported

Higher frequency of occurrences reported

Editors

Publishers
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Ethics in peer review

Lower frequency of occurrences reported

Higher frequency of occurrences reported

Editors

Publishers
As an editor, what do you consider a realistic amount of time to expect reviewers to deliver their initial report?

- 7 days: 48%
- 14 days: 6%
- 30 days: 41%
- 2 months: 4%
- 6 months: 0.4%
- 7+ months: 0.0%
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As an **editor**, what do you consider a realistic amount of time to expect reviewers to deliver their initial report?

- 7 days: 0.4%
- 14 days: 6%
- 30 days: 48%
- 2 months: 41%
- 6 months: 4%
- 7+ months: 0.0%
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As a reviewer, how long was the duration between your acceptance to review and the delivery of your initial report?

- 7 days: 7%
- 14 days: 16%
- 30 days: 40%
- 2 months: 30%
- 6 months: 5%
- 7+ months: 1%

Time in peer review
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As a reviewer, how long was the duration between your acceptance to review and the delivery of your initial report?

- 7 days: 7%
- 14 days: 16%
- 30 days: 40%
- 2 months: 30%
- 6 months: 5%
- 7+ months: 1%

Time in peer review

1 2 3 4 5

@TandFEditors #TandFEditors
As an author, how long did you wait after submission before you received the peer reviewer’s initial comments?

- 7 days: 1%
- 14 days: 4%
- 30 days: 9%
- 2 months: 30%
- 6 months: 42%
- 7+ months: 13%
As an author, how long did you wait after submission before you received the peer reviewer’s initial comments?

- 7 days: 1%
- 14 days: 4%
- 30 days: 9%
- 2 months: 30%
- 6 months: 42%
- 7+ months: 13%
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Time in peer review
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Time in peer review

Editors
2 months is realistic

Reviewers
2 months to deliver report

Authors
2 months to receive report

96%
93%
44%
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Time in peer review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Editors</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Editors</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2 months is realistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 months to deliver report</td>
<td>2 months to receive report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reviewers</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2 months to deliver report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Authors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2 months to receive report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As an author, I am usually kept well informed about the progress of my article through the peer review process.
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As an author, I would like to see average peer review times, from submission to decision to publish, displayed on a journal's website.

Time in peer review
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To come:

1. Motivations to review
2. Training and support
3. Geographical analysis

Updates and new supplements on Author Services and Editor Resources