

## • The reviewer's role

- Consejos de perro viejo 🐶 by [Nicolas Robinson-Garcia](#)
- **Disclaimer:** Editor asociado de Scientometrics
- La revisión, un trabajo invisible pero ¿necesario?

**Gemma E Derrick**   
@GemmaDerrick · [Follow](#)

Am questioning the practice of only submitting your papers to one journal at a time. Surely if journals are making money from publicly funded research then they should be bidding/competing for our work?

10:23 AM · Feb 9, 2023 

---

 49  Reply  Share

[Read 3 replies](#)

- Tipos de revisiones:

- Ciego

- Doble ciego

Adivina quién es el autor:

Baldwin, S. (2019). *Psychological statistics and psychometrics using Stata*. College Station, Bengisu, M. (2003). Critical and emerging technologies in materials, manufacturing, i 473–487. [10.1023/B:SCIE.0000006875.61813.f6](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SCIE.0000006875.61813.f6).  
Bornmann, L., & Daniel, H.-D. (2008). Selecting manuscripts for a high impact journal tl by *Angewandte chemie international edition*, or rejected but published elsewhere. *Jc* 1841–1852. [10.1002/asi.20901](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20901).  
Bornmann, L., Devarakonda, S., Tekles, A., & Chacko, G. (2020). Are disruption index in assessments by peers. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(3), 1242–1259.  
Bornmann, L., Haunschild, R., & Mutz, R. (2021). Growth rates of modern science: A established and new literature databases. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communica*  
Bornmann, L., Marx, W., & Barth, A. (2013). The normalization of citation counts basec  
Bornmann, L., & Mutz, R. (2015). Growth rates of modern science: A bibliometric anal  
Association for Information Science and Technology, 66(11), 2215–2222. [10.1002/asi.21418](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21418).  
Bornmann, L., Mutz, R., Neuhaus, C., & Daniel, H.-D. (2008). Use of citation counts for r and presenting and interpreting results. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, i  
Bornmann, L., Schier, H., Marx, W., & Daniel, H. (2011). Is interactive open access pu validity of *atmospheric chemistry and physics* by using percentile rank classes. *Journa* [10.1002/asi.21418](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21418).  
Bornmann, L., & Wohlrabe, K. (2019). Normalisation of citation impact in economics. *S*  
Boyack, K. W., & Klavans, R. (2010). Co-citation analysis, bibliographic coupling, and accurately? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 6 Braam, R. R., & Bruij, J. (1992). Quality of indexing information: Authors views on inde Science, 18(5), 399–408. [10.1177/016555159201800508](https://doi.org/10.1177/016555159201800508).  
Clarivate Analytics and Chinese Academy of Sciences. (2010). Research Fronts 2010. Cl

- Abierta - [Ejemplo](#)

## • ¿Por qué te piden que revises un paper?

- Cada vez es más difícil encontrar revisores
- En muchas ocasiones se tira de conocimiento tácito (doctorandos de colegas, presentaciones de congresos, Google Scholar)
- Los jóvenes son revisores más serios que los investigadores senior
- Las primeras asignaciones suelen ser pruebas de fogueo

- No esperes que te asignen trabajos de investigadores relevantes de primeras
- Es normal que te suelan asignar siempre los manuscritos de autores específicos o temas concretos
- Los editores tenemos nuestras listas de revisores *premium*
- [Mi listado de revisores](#)

## • ¿Qué espera un revisor de ti?

- Ayuda a la hora de decidir si rechazar un paper o no. **Motiva tu recomendación**
- Sé educado y ayuda a los autores. **Si rechazas justifica, si no te gusta sé dulce y si te gusta reconócelo**
- En la medida de lo posible, cumple con los plazo, y si no puedes **habla con tu editor**.

## • ¿Qué no espera un revisor de ti?

- Saber lo listo que eres
- Que te limites a resumir el contenido del paper
- Que le digas qué entra y qué no en el alcance de la revista
- Que hagas de editor de textos. Eso no quita que señales si el texto está mal redactado o es ilegible.

## • Ejemplo malo

Reviewer #1: First of all, I would like to point out that I am not a native English speaker. But in this paper, I find it quite difficult to understand it. I think it should be reviewed by a native English speaker.

The paper is not very relevant and I would advise against publishing it. The main reasons are (if I understood correctly, due to the problem with English):  
 (a) A new indicator is used which is not contrasted with well-known indicators, but with others that are also used in this paper.  
 b) The role of the indicator "Journal Index of Percentile Ranking with 6 Classifications" (page 15) is not clear.  
 c) The role of the "Average Percentile in Subject Area" indicator is also unclear.  
 d) A small sample is studied

Some suggestions for improvement (although, again, I would not publish the paper):  
 (a) Cut the introduction a lot. Specifically, the paragraph "As one kind of ..." page 2).  
 b) Cut out a lot of section 2, including table 1 and all the variants included in table 2 (perhaps the authors would consider writing a review article with that material).  
 c) Improve the English or wording. Specifically, I suggest better rewriting of the paragraph "Most scholars believe..." (page 10) and the two opening paragraphs on page 13.  
 d) Cut out all the details of data processing and synthesise only the most important ones.  
 e) The role of the data in table 10 is not clear.

## • Otro ejemplo malo

Reviewer #2: The article deals with a topic of enormous relevance and interest, such as the study of the disruption index, on which one of the authors has made notable contributions in the last three years. In this paper they introduce a disruption index, not for papers neither authors, but for journals based on the Open Citations Index of Crossref open DOI-to-DOI citations. Overall, the article contains material that, in substance, I consider acceptable for publication in Scientometrics, although some issues of form make certain issues somewhat difficult to understand. Specifically, I would indicate the following:

1. The JDI expression introduced in expression (2) seems original to this work; at least this reviewer has not seen it in previous works by the authors and perhaps it is the central point of the article, so it should be clear in the writing of the article.
2. Starting from the previous premise, it would be necessary to clarify whether Dz represents the absolute value of D (i.e.:  $|D|$ ) or refers to the indicator defined by Liu (2020).
3. In the case of absolute value, I wonder what sense it makes to apply the logarithmic transformation, since it is indicated when the variable takes very large values and you want to change

## • Ejemplo bueno

Reviewer #2: Dear editor,

Many thanks for providing me the early opportunity to read this interesting manuscript.

In their article, the authors present an analysis of media attention directed to Covid-19 research. In particular, they are interested in the alignment of scientific attention (measured by citation counts) and media attention. They test whether such alignment occurs consistently across articles originating from different countries and find that Chinese articles receive fewer media mentions compared to articles from other parts of the world, given equal scientific impact.

I think the authors address an important topic that is clearly of relevance to the readership of Scientometrics. Also, they perform a fairly elaborate set of analyses, aiming to demonstrate the robustness of their findings. Nevertheless, I have several concerns, mainly regarding the authors' conclusions and some of the analyses. Below I provide an overview of my main concerns. I hope these comments will allow the authors to develop their manuscript. I suggest several modifications to the presentation of analyses and findings, as well as some additional analyses. I hope the authors find these useful and will be able to follow up on these suggestions.

My main concerns relates to the manuscript's conclusion section.

## • Algunos apuntes personales sobre cómo estructurar una revisión

- Un párrafo inicial describiendo el paper y una valoración general equilibrada del contenido.
- En caso de **no** rechazo:
  - Lista de puntos de MAJOR COMMENTS -> Cuestiones metodológicas, estructura, datos, interpretación de resultados
  - Listado de puntos de MINOR COMMENTS -> Cuestiones de estilo, idiomáticas, matizaciones que no contradicen el mensaje principal
- En caso de rechazo:
  - Listado motivado de razones por las que el paper es rechazado MAJOR LIMITATIONS
  - Listado de MINOR COMMENTS para señalar otras cuestiones que, sin ser determinantes para el rechazo, deben ser resueltas en el futuro.

## • Los tiempos

- Un buen editor no debe abusar de ti
- **Márcate un tope de revisiones al año y una vez llegues, cierra** -> Entre 10-12 revisiones al año está muy bien
- Prioriza las revistas TOP y las importantes de tu área