Review of: "An Empirical Study of Goal Intentions and Monetary Compensation for Reviewers in Information Science"

David M. Schultz[1]

1 The University of Manchester

The authors perform an interesting analysis based on a survey of 193 authors in four information science journals. I am not from an information science background, so many of the techniques and approaches in sections 2.2.7 and 3 were unfamiliar to me. Thus, I only provide comments on those sections that I understood.

My advice to improve the manuscript revolves around these five major points.

1. SCIENTIFIC QUESTIONS.

A. Could the reason why reviewers are less motivated be that workloads are increasing? I have seen numerous studies recently showing that the workloads and the pressures to achieve among academics are increasing. Can this statement be included and properly evidenced?

B. I thought some of the questions were rather weak. For example, Question 4, "I work hard in the peer-review process," If I were answering that question, I don't know how I would respond. Writing the review comes easy, but it is a time sink from things that I could otherwise be doing that are often more interesting. So, what number would I select?

C. Question 5 is also a weak question: "The quality of my reviewer report is very high." The Dunning-Kruger effect seems appropriate here (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunning–Kruger_effect). Speaking as an editor, I think many reviewers think they are submitting a high-quality review, but that review is not useful in my decision making because it is not detailed enough or not critical enough. Given the high rejection rates at some journals (exceeding 50%), many authors overestimate their aptitude for writing publishable work. Those same authors may also be writing reviews that overestimate their aptitude in writing reviews.

D. I know it is too late to redo the survey, but how about asking reviewers how much time they spent reading the paper and writing the review? That would be one way to quantify reviewer effort. See, for example, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00129.1.

2. LONG, REDUNDANT SECTIONS. I felt that some sections were repetitive and long-winded. They could be reduced and communicated in a much simpler and shorter manner. Doing so would make others more likely to read the manuscript.

A. The example on p. 5 of Max and Mary is a nice example, but it seems to state the obvious. Could it be reduced in length?

B. Content in section 2.2.2 repeats content earlier in the manuscript.

C. Questions 5–8 seem to address the same points, and indeed yields similar results. Does it all need to be presented?

D. The graphs in Figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5 all have the same shape. Thus, presenting 18 different panels seems redundant. Is there a way to condense this information? Are all 18 panels needed?

3. INTRODUCTION. The introduction could be improved.

A. I didn't see the problem statement that the authors were trying to address and how that was arrived at from the previous literature. What was the motivation for this particular project? Why is it important? I didn't get a strong sense of this.

B. Huisman and Smits (2017) is described, but not with sufficient detail for the reader to have perspective. What journal(s)? What discipline? How is "review time" calculated? Other journals publish their results of review time and they are closer to 3–8 weeks (e.g., https://www.cell.com/cell/authors#eev; https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/journal-information#loc-timely-publication), or even 6 days (e.g., https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/science-of-the-total-environment). Why does this study find a substantially higher value?

C. In general, I felt that there were many citations that could have been included, but weren't. The literature on reviewers and their behavior is much larger than this introduction shows. The authors should respect the work that came before them and appropriate acknowledge where your work fits relative to the previous work.

D. The long paragraphs on procrastination, rewards and motivation, etc., seems overly academic and excessive. More literature focusing on the motivations and behavior of reviewers should be included. Moreover, this long text is not linked back to the authors' results, bringing the paper full circle.

E. Even after reading the introduction, I'm still not sure that I understand the meaning of "higher goals". Perhaps more definition is needed.

F. Some statements in the introduction are uncited. These need to be cited.

4. IMPROVED COMMUNICATION. There were instances where clearer communication was needed.

A. Abstract. The term "present bias" is used, but is not defined. As such, readers unfamiliar with this term (as I was) would be confused. Is it coined by the authors? Is it sourced from another reference? Please state.

B. Abstract. "Higher evaluation goals" is used, but not defined. Again, I struggled to understand the abstract without some information about what this term meant.

C. p. 6: I didn't understand the sentence "a potential limitation of our study is that most of the survey questions could be

subject to social desirability bias, as they were asked directly, rather than using an alternative scheme (for example, a vignette design)." Could this be said more simply?

5. FORMAT AND STYLE. The manuscript could be improved by considering the reader in formatting the manuscript.

A. There are no page numbers or line numbers in the manuscript.

B. Paragraphs should be indented to improve readability.

C. Citations are often not in the correct format within the sentence (e.g., within parentheses when only the year should be in parentheses).

D. Journal names should be italicized.