Suggestions for Reviewers, Referees, Editors (and Members of Institutional Review Boards)

- Base acceptance on the quality of the design, implementation, analysis, and writing (as well as the importance of the questions being studied), but not on the results of the analysis
- See the Suggestions for Researchers.
  - Have authors followed these guidelines?
- See the Suggestions for Reading Research.
  - Is the paper written to facilitate reading following these suggestions?
  - How would a reader following these guidelines rate the research?
- Is the research "reproducible"? That is, is the information given in the paper and the material referenced in the paper adequate for someone to duplicate the data gathering and analysis?
- Check to be sure power calculations are prospective, not retrospective.
- As needed, join with others to help promote "best practices" in research and publication.
- Consult the references below for more suggestions.

Further References:

J. Coyne (2009), Are most positive findings in health psychology false ... or at least somewhat exaggerated?, European Health Psychologist, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 49 - 51.


Nature.com Peer-to-Peer blog, now closed, but archives online at http://blogs.nature.com/peer-to-peer/


This is an editorial response to the Ioannis article mentioned in the course descriptions and introduction to Day 1 of this SSI course.

Note: For an online version of these suggestions with embedded links, see http://www.ma.utexas.edu/users/mks/statmistakes/refereesandeditors.html