



Turkish Archives of Otorhinolaryngology

Türk Otorinolarenoloji Arşivi

Editorial

Nameless Heroes: Our Peer-reviewers

While the history of being a reviewer or expert in medicine goes back to the 9th century, the term of reviewership in scientific publication firstly appeared in the middle of 1700s (1). For a scientific paper to be published, an author, editorial board, reviewer and publishing company staff are required. The aim of this group is to reach a scientific study to wide audience, in other words to the individuals engaged in related discipline (2). In the publication of a scientific paper, while the names of authors, editor and assistants, and publication company are known, the reviewers, who play an important role in this process, stay nameless heroes, unfortunately. However, during the process, the duties of reviewers are very significant and even; their opinions play the most important role in making decision on whether or not the submitted article is suitable for publication (2-4).

The term “peer-review” in English is the evaluation of a manuscript by the experts on the related area of specialization. Although there are some methods including double-blinded, single-blinded or others that are applied today, the principle is the same. The peer-reviewer evaluates the submitted manuscript independently and in unbiased way, criticizes it and gives suggestions for the points that are possible to be corrected. During this process, the reviewer has responsibilities towards the author, editor, patients and study subjects, and the related scientific branch (2-5).

For a good evaluation, the peer-reviewer should be familiar to the journal that the manuscript is submitted and know the instructions for authors who will submit their studies to that journal. Although each reviewer has a distinctive evaluation method, in general, the manuscript is read carefully at the beginning. Firstly, the aim of the study, the method used in the study, and the suitability of selected patients and subjects in terms of quality and quantity are assessed. Then, the results obtained from the study and discussion on these results with literature are considered. In the meantime, the consistency of the results and the conformity of the statistical method used for analysis are evaluated. After that, the extent of discussion with literature considering appropriate and current references and the extent of displaying the strengths and weaknesses or limitations of the study are evaluated. Finally, the manuscript that has been evaluated in terms of form (grammar, spelling, tables, figures and proper abbreviations) is assessed with regard to intelligibility and gains that readers will acquire from that study. Then, it is checked for its conformity with scientific writing ethics and the evaluation process is completed (3-6).

The reviewer sends his/her evaluations to authors and editor. While doing that, he/she pays attention for not sending reports that are inconsistent with each other (while writing about rejection to the editor, reflecting to authors that the manuscript would be accepted if it is revised). In the evaluation report that is sent to authors, views, comments or suggestions should be objective and clear. It is very important to use a polite manner in the report and to make suggestions and constructive criticism that will improve the manuscript (2-6).

The reviewers, who read a manuscript for many times, search the related literature, provide control, spend time and make a great effort for finishing the evaluation report during these stages, are the greatest helpers of editors and editorial boards in scientific publication.

We, the Editorial board of the Turkish Archives of Otorhinolaryngology, are thankful to our reviewers, our nameless heroes, for their great contributions to our journal and for their dedication.

References

1. Spier R. The history of the peer-review process. *Trends Biotechnol* 2002; 20: 357-8.
2. Onat A. Editörün Sorumlulukları ile Danışman ve Yazar Açılarında Tutumu. *Cerrahpaşa Tıp Derg* 2008; 39: 88-92.
3. Peh WC, Ng KH. Role of the manuscript reviewer. *Singapore Med J* 2009; 50: 931-3.
4. Ramsden VR, Pimlott N, Woollard R, Kvern B, Handford C, Dunikowski L, et al. Becoming a peer reviewer: engaging in sharing and gaining knowledge. *Can Fam Physician* 2014; 60: 1158-60.
5. Wagner AK, Boninger ML, Levy C, Chan L, Gater D, Kirby RL. Peer review: issues in physical medicine and rehabilitation. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2003; 82: 790-802.
6. Azer SA, Ramani S, Peterson R. Becoming a peer reviewer to medical education journals. *Med Teach* 2012; 34: 698-704.

In the name of Editorial Board
Prof. Taner Kemal Erdağ