Being a good reviewer and a good author in the context of peer-review, 2 credits

Intended learning outcomes

The aim of this class is to give graduate students tools and guidelines to approach a core activity in academia: peer-review. At the end of the class students should be able to:

- navigate when it is appropriate to review a manuscript,
- write a constructive review,
- respond to a reviewer’s comment in a way that is respectful and readable to both reviewers and editors that receive them.

Pre-requisites

- Have a full draft of a manuscript that can be reviewed by someone (this will be used for the core activity of the class)
- Be at least 2 students in a relatively connected field (can sign up with a friend)
- Open to advanced MSc, PhD, and PostDocs if they fulfill the 2 criteria above

Class plan

- Class 1 January 20th 2020 13:15-15:00: What is peer review; history; what makes a review good. Examples of good/bad reviews.
  - Assignment: give your paper to one other student who will peer review it.
  - Submit peer-review on Friday
- Class 2 January 27th 2020 13:15-15:00: Discuss what was challenging about reviewing. What is the reaction to the review you got? Discuss best practices for responding (structure, how much you need to address, when to start over).
  - Assignment: write a formal response to the review of your paper.
  - Submit response to review on Friday
- Class 3 February 3rd 2020 13:15-15:00: What is the referee’s reaction to author responses?
  - Assignment: write a second shorter review of revised paper.
  - Submit review on Friday

Examination

This is a pass/fail class. To pass a student must:

- Attend all 3 sessions and actively participate
- Submit a review of a peer’s paper (2x)
- Submit a response to reviews

Examiner: Geneviève Metson, Theoretical Biology, IFM