

Research & Reviews: Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology

About peer review in Microbiology and Biotechnology

Bassols AC^{1*}

¹Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Distrito Federal, Mexico

Editorial

Received date: 21/08/2015
Accepted date: 24/08/2015
Published date: 27/08/2015

*For Correspondence

Bassols AC, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Distrito Federal, Mexico

E-mail: acbassols@gmail.com

EDITORIAL

1. Peer review is the assessment by experts of material submitted for publication. The peer reviewer serves the editor by substantiating the quality of the manuscript, and serves the author by giving constructive criticism ^[1].
2. Peer reviewers play a key role in contributing to the quality, the value, and even the reputation of science.
3. Delays in peer reviewed publication may have consequences for both assessment of scientific prowess in academics as well as communication of important information to the knowledge receptor community. Majority of participants attributed lengthy review times to the 'stress' on the peer-review system ^[2].
4. The accuracy, validity, and appropriateness of what gets published in the medical literature depend upon a pool of competent peer referees.
5. Peer-reviewed biomedical journals are expected to publish accurate and important information. Previously, Ethical considerations related to the publication of a paper are likely to receive little attention ^[3].
6. The editors of medical journals should take the steps necessary to assure its readers that the contents of their publications are based in true data, that they are original and fulfill the ethical rules of biomedical and clinical research, including its reporting. Universities should enforce the teaching of ethical rules that govern the report of scientific information ^[4].
7. As is known, the referees do not receive any financial reward for their work. What, then, they win by collaborating with the magazines? The answer is complex. First, it is clear that being chosen as an expert to evaluate a research paper is recognition and confers a certain prestige. Moreover, when an original article is reviewed, they have privileged access to relevant information for the research work itself.
8. Conflicts of interest, in which financial and personal considerations may affect the investigator's personal judgment, can seriously damage the integrity of the author and of the Journal ^[5,6].
9. In the academic world, peer review is one of the major processes in evaluating a scholar's contribution ^[7].
10. A "peer" is a physician with expertise on the subject under scrutiny who spends sufficient time and thought to fulfill two main obligations: to render an honest, unbiased decision on whether or not the manuscript should be published and, if it is acceptable, to help make it better. The review of the work is one of the basic duties of the scientific community, always with the aim of contributing to increasing the rigor and validity of the knowledge generated ^[8,9].

REFERENCES

1. Olson CM. Peer review of the biomedical literature. Am J Emerg Med. 1990; 8: 356-358.
2. Thomas M. Annesley. Seven Reasons Not to Be a Peer Reviewer—And Why These Reasons Are Wrong. Clinical Chemistry. 2012; 58: 677-679.

3. Nguyen VM, et al. How Long Is Too Long in Contemporary Peer Review? Perspectives from Authors Publishing in Conservation Biology Journals. *PLoS One*. 2015; 10: e0132557.
4. Salasche SJ. How to "peer review" a medical journal manuscript. *Dermatol Surg*. 1997; 23: 423-428.
5. Roberts J. An Author's Guide to Publication Ethics: A Review of Emerging Standards in Biomedical Journals. *Headache: The Journal of Head and Face Pain*. 2009; 49: 578-589.
6. Kempers RD. Ethical issues in biomedical publications. *Fertil Steril*. 2002; 77: 883-888.
7. Reyes H. Honesty and good faith: Two cornerstones in the ethics of biomedical Publications. *Rev Méd Chile*. 2007; 135: 415-418.
8. Campanario JM. El sistema de revision por expertos (peer-review): muchos problemas y pocas soluciones. *Revista española de Documentación Científica*. 2002; 25: 267-285.
9. Zhu J, et al. Evaluating the Pros and Cons of Different Peer Review Policies via Simulation. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2015.