

Peer Review Week 2017: Transparency



September 11–17, 2017 marks the third annual Peer Review Week. Started in 2015 by a group of organizations in the scholarly publishing field, the event recognizes the importance of peer review and the individuals who work tirelessly as reviewers and editors. This year's theme is "Transparency in Review."

Transparency might seem like a surprising theme for an event celebrating peer review, as many journals feature a single- or double-blind review process, built on the theory that a more fair review is brought about by some level of anonymity. But transparency is a far broader subject than just the identity of who reviewed each paper—many times the entire process is convoluted, and authors generally don't get to see "behind the scenes" unless they also serve on an editorial board for a journal.

So let's talk about *CORROSION*. What's our approach to peer review? For starters, we use a single-blind review process, meaning that our reviewers know the identity of the authors, but our authors don't know who reviewed their manuscript.

When a manuscript is submitted, Associate Editors are assigned new manuscripts from the Technical Editor in Chief. The Associate Editors are subject area experts for *CORROSION* covering a broad range of corrosion industry sectors such as oil and gas, nuclear, concrete and soil, materials types, various forms of corrosion (i.e., SCC, pitting, inhibitors), and relevant techniques or analysis approaches. Peer reviewers are individually hand-picked, overseen, and rated by our editors, who also independently read and review our manuscripts. In our process, reviewers examine the content of a submitted manuscript to see whether it articulates a compelling set of needs, gaps, and opportunities in corrosion science and/or engineering, has been placed into the context of the literature, and then, most importantly, whether the manuscript furnishes compelling original and novel work that is rigorous, thorough, statistically significant, and contributes to the permanent record of corrosion science and engineering. Reviewers are invited to assess all sections of a manuscript including the citations to see if the authors can frame what's new with their work, what builds on existing literature, or why the manuscript overturns the prevailing view (see our "Peer Review" webpage for some of the questions reviewers assess). Authors are allowed some speculation in a discussion, but must present results using systematic testing and ensuring rigorous data collection with appropriate precision and accuracy, analysis, and interpretation.

Sometimes rapid feedback is given to authors in the form of pre-screening of manuscripts by the editorial board, who function as "identified" peer reviewers. These pre-screens are intended to help authors focus on preparations that enable more successful blind peer review.

Final decisions on every manuscript are made by editors with substantial and careful consideration of the reviewers' point of view, the editor's unblended interpretation weighed by the journal's mission, standards for quality, and consistency from manuscript to manuscript. In these ways, peer reviewers ensure the enduring value of manuscripts submitted to *CORROSION* so that they are long-lasting, valuable contributions to corrosion knowledge.

Our Associate Editors and peer reviewers have helped shaped the scope of *CORROSION*, both in terms of content and global perspective (editors are from 6 different countries and our reviewers have hailed from over 50 countries). Their attention to detail, hard work, and knowledge shine through in their dedication. Reviewers and editors are an integral part of who we are and will be for years to come, contributing to *CORROSION*'s longevity (73 years!).

From all of us at *CORROSION*, we thank everyone who has served as a reviewer or editor.

Dr. John R. Scully
Technical Editor in Chief

Sammy Miles
Managing Editor in Chief

To learn more about Peer Review Week, visit peerreviewweek.org. To learn more about *CORROSION*'s peer review, visit corrosionjournal.org/page/peerreview.