

## **Reviewer** ***ASA, CSSA, and SSSA Position Description***

The volunteer peer reviewer evaluates submissions for technical and intellectual content. The review will be fair, unbiased, rapid, and confidential. The reviewer evaluates the manuscripts in terms of the appropriateness of the subject. In this connection, original research findings suitable for publication in the journal are interpreted as the outcome of scholarly inquiry, investigation, or experimentation having as an objective the development of new concepts; the revision, refinement, extension, or verification of existing concepts; the application of existing concepts to new situations; or the development of new or improved techniques. The reviewer also determines whether a manuscript meets the high standard of quality of the publication. Quality includes originality of subject or applications, appropriateness of methods, accuracy of mathematical equations and computations, validity of conclusions, organization of subject matter, clarity, and communicational competence. The reviewer understands that the reward of the review process is the circle of scientific communication shared by publishing and reviewing scientists. The reviewer performs his/her tasks with excellence, bearing in mind that he/she has benefited from this service in the past and is returning this service to the scientific community and advancing the profession.

**To become a reviewer**, contact the editor of the journal for which you want to review manuscripts. Provide your contact information along with key words of your specialty area.

**To update your reviewer information**, do so at the appropriate Manuscript Tracker website(s): <http://www.manuscripttracker.com/>.

### **Guidelines for Professional and Ethical Conduct of the Review Process of ASA, CSSA, and SSSA Journals**

Scientists agree that peer review is a cornerstone of scientific progress. As such, participating in the peer review process of ASA, CSSA, and SSSA journals is a privilege and a responsibility. A professional, objective, and thorough review process will benefit us as publishing researchers, improve the professionalism of our community, and enhance the quality of our published research. In agreeing to serve, one agrees to the following code of conduct, with the understanding that failure to serve in this capacity may lead to dismissal:

- I will take responsibility for understanding the function of my office and executing to the best of my ability all tasks that are within my area of responsibility.
- In my capacity I will work to maintain the integrity of the peer review process to ensure that the manuscript receives a thorough, quality review in accordance with the high scientific standards of the journal.
- I will handle my share of manuscripts, understanding that this is an obligation of the peer review process.
- I agree it is my responsibility to handle those manuscripts in the areas of my expertise and assist in finding persons qualified to handle papers in those areas outside my expertise.
- I will execute my role within the specified schedule of the journal, understanding that failure to do so would detract from the quality of the journal and retard the professional development of the authors affected by a delay.
- I will communicate with authors only in the capacity as defined by my role.

- I will communicate with authors in a respectful and professional manner, including substantiating comments with published sources and understanding that I represent the journal and the Society(ies) through my tone and attitude. I understand that criticism of a manuscript should not extend to personal criticism of the author(s).
- I will review each manuscript with impartiality, without regard to gender, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, institutional affiliation, or other similar bias.
- I will evaluate manuscripts on the basis of scientific merit, with the understanding that there may be many acceptable ways to prove a hypothesis. I will respect the independence of authors and their creativity and understand that differences of opinion can be addressed in published comments within the journal as a forum for scientific debate.
- I will treat the manuscript in review as a confidential document, and neither disclose its contents outside the context of the review process, nor use its contents in my own work.
- I will avoid conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflicts of interest stemming from my relationship with the author or professional and financial circumstances that may bias my approach to a manuscript.

Filename: ed\_guide\_reviewers.doc  
Directory: H:\Editorial\Position Descriptions  
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\sue\Application  
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot  
Title: Reviewer  
Subject:  
Author: ASA  
Keywords:  
Comments:  
Creation Date: 3/15/2007 1:05:00 PM  
Change Number: 9  
Last Saved On: 3/15/2007 4:20:00 PM  
Last Saved By: ASA  
Total Editing Time: 125 Minutes  
Last Printed On: 3/15/2007 4:20:00 PM  
As of Last Complete Printing  
Number of Pages: 2  
Number of Words: 688 (approx.)  
Number of Characters: 3,925 (approx.)