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
  - For example, a well-done study with a negative result for a worthwhile question is more worthy of publication than a poorly-done study with a novel result.
- 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. These include:
  - Establishing guidelines for submission that encourage best practices.
  - Establishing submission options for registered replications of important but unreplicated results. Examples include:
  - Encourage collaborations to increase power for research studies and replications.
- Consult the references below for more suggestions.
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This is an editorial response to the Ioannis article mentioned in the course descriptions and introduction to Day 1 of this SSI course.