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Part I:
Why peer review?
Why Will We Spend 75 Minutes on Peer Review?

• Like other topics discussed today, no class exists on making our way through the peer review process
• But, this is a critical portion of our training and careers, no matter our career paths
• Key goal: Identify concrete, clear peer review strategies

What Do We Mean by “(Gross) Anatomy”?

• Gross anatomy (from Wiki): ‘the branch of anatomy that deals with the structure of organs and tissues that are visible to the naked eye”
• Peer review (from me):
  o Some parts of the process are visible
  o Other parts, no so much
  o Here, we will make all parts visible!!
  o Demystify process, make it work for us
First, some questions:
Show of hands, have you....

....ever submitted a manuscript for publication?
....ever had a manuscript rejected for publication?

....ever submitted the same manuscript to multiple journals?
...ever had a manuscript go through multiple revisions at a journal before it was accepted at that journal?

...ever had a manuscript accepted for publication?
Do you like the peer review process?

Part II: Brief primer on the peer review process
Review Process in a Nutshell

• Seven components to every submission
  o Author(s) choose(s) journal outlet for submission
  o Author(s) prepare(s) manuscript for submission format
  o Author(s) submit(s) the manuscript and cover letter
  o Editor-in-Chief selects “Action Editor”
  o Action Editor selects reviewers, who subsequently submit evaluations of the manuscript
  o Action Editor reads manuscript/reviews, makes decision
  o If decision is to “revise and resubmit,” author revises manuscript in line with reviewer commentary and sends back for further consideration
Editor and Reviewer Selections

• Editorial Board
  o Editor-in-Chief
  o Associate Editor(s)
  o Editorial Consultants
• Editor-in-Chief selects “Action Editor”
• Action Editor selects reviewers

Review Timelines

• From time of submission, most reviews for psychology journals will take 2-3 months
• Medical journals often take much less time (e.g., 1 month)
• Review timelines may vary depending on how hard it is for an Editor to “find” reviewers
Review Decisions

• Action Editor reads the reviews and manuscript
• One of three decisions
  o Accept
  o Reject
  o Revise and Resubmit
• Most published papers were originally R & R
• Thus, crucial to have strong “R & R Skills”!!

The Bad News

• Reliability of the peer-review process is worse than the least reliable measure in any of your own studies
• Reliability = Correlation between two independent assessors’ ratings of the same submission
• Issues with unreliability apply to all forms of peer review (i.e., manuscripts and grants)
The Bad News

- Cicchetti (1991): Manuscript submissions: .19-.54 (Median = .30)
- Marsh et al. (2008): Grant submissions to the Australian Research Council: .15 for “quality of proposal” ratings and .21 for “quality of research team” ratings

The Good News

- Once you get your manuscript to the “Revise & Resubmit” stage, you will reap the benefits of what may be the saving grace of peer review
Have you said to yourself: “This revised paper is worse than the first version I submitted to this journal”? 
On Behalf of Peer Review, I Promise You….

- if you submit your manuscript,
- get suggestions from peers,
- revise the manuscript accordingly, and
- resubmit to the journal for consideration,
- the “finished product” will be a superior piece of scholarship, relative to the version of your manuscript that you initially submitted for publication

Part III:
Making peer review work for you: An anatomical map
Our Map

• For those of you who remember, get out your nostalgia hats
• For those of you who have no idea what this over here is… →
• … Each point on the map carries with it a piece of advice about peer review
• Starting with…

Nose
Do Your Detective Work!

- The peer review process begins well before you click “submit”
- This is because you have a surprising degree of control over who becomes your reviewers!
- Pick journals to submit based, in part, on the Editorial Board
- Who will give you a fair review?

Pick My Reviewers?!

- Yes you can!! And should!
- Marsh et al. (2008): Submissions viewed more favorably when applicant selects reviewers
- Helps put your submission on a level playing field with senior researchers
- But how do you select reviewers?
How to Select Reviewers

• In the cover letter, identify 2-4 reviewers
• Make sure 1-2 reviewers are on the Editorial Board
• (Illustration #1)

In our experience it has been quite difficult to identify reviewers knowledgeable in the specific area on which this manuscript is based, that being DESCRIPTION OF CONTENT AREA. Thus, we are happy to provide names of reviewers who are knowledgeable in the manuscript’s primary area of focus: NAME OF REVIEWER (REVIEWER EMAIL), NAME OF REVIEWER (REVIEWER EMAIL), and NAME OF REVIEWER (REVIEWER EMAIL).
Limbic System

Scenario: You just got the decision letter on your manuscript
• How do you feel?
• Can you possibly make rational decisions now?
• Answer: No!!
• You just waited 2-3 (or 6!) months to get a decision!
• (Illustration #2)
Dear Dr. Andres De Los Reyes:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript entitled "Mother-Child Rating Discrepancies of Parental Monitoring: Consistent Through a Two-Year Follow-Up and Predict Child Delinquent Behaviors Two Years Later". The reviewers have made recommendations for revisions that must be addressed before your article will be considered further for publication in the Journal of Youth and Adolescence. The reviewers and I are quite impressed by your work, but would like some clarifications before determining whether to pursue it for publication in our Journal.

Given the importance of your work to the study of adolescence, I certainly hope that you intend to revise. I would welcome the opportunity to work with you and look forward to the receiving your revised manuscript soon. Thank you again for considering the Journal of Youth and Adolescence.

Sincerely yours,

Roger J.R. Levesque, J.D., Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Youth and Adolescence

Reviewer #2: Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript. The paper has important strengths, not the least of which are its use of strong measures and longitudinal data. Regrettably, the manuscript has important limitations that considerably dampen my enthusiasm.

First, although the study does address important issues and addresses relevant literature, the study fails to engage literature relating to the adolescent period. In this regard, the manuscript absolutely misses the boat. A look at its references reveals no focus at all on Effects. Given these, it is really difficult to be convinced that the proposed manuscript is making an important, original contribution since the authors themselves have not bothered to examine relevant literature.
Second, although the literature review is interesting, it is quite lacking not just in the substantive content relating to the research areas (see above) but also in terms of what a literature review is supposed to do. It is supposed to give readers a sense of the field, address key variables that will be studied, and then lead to testable hypotheses. The current paper does not do that. In addition to the content issues reported above, there would need to be research presented relating to the group that is studied (high risk neighborhoods). In short, the literature review should be closely tied to the hypotheses, data/methods. The current paper simply does not do that.

Given the above issues, I have not read the rest. But, I could not help to take a peek at the discussion. The discussion fails to engage relevant literature.

I would encourage the authors to revise. The manuscript would need to start the review process from scratch given the severe limitations of the current version. One of the clear contributions that this manuscript can do, I hope, is bring other literature/theories/approaches to the study of adolescence. The current version is just not developed enough.
Peek and Let it Sit

- Skim the decision letter
- Did you get an invite to Revise and Resubmit?
- Great, let it sit for 2-3 days
- Was it rejected?
- Do the same thing, let it sit
- The further out from the decision, the easier it will be to get the “planning” parts of your brain to kick into action!

Frontal Lobe
Itemize Your Decision Letter

- Right from the outset, first thing to do is create your “to-do list”!
- Go to the reviews and start numbering your comments (even if the reviewers did not do that for you)
- Your to-do list should be the template of the cover letter you send back to the Editor (Illustration #3)

Dear Dr. XXXX:

Thank you for the positive feedback regarding our manuscript, "TITLE". We are very pleased that you have invited this manuscript for revision and resubmission to the JOURNAL for review. We are also very grateful for your helpful suggestions and those of the reviewers. Indeed, the comments allowed us to carefully rethink SOME STUFF, OTHER STUFF, and STILL OTHER STUFF. Specifically, we have.... Further, we have.... We have highlighted in yellow all of the text revisions. Permit us to describe our revisions and their scope:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editorial Commentary</th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. COMMENT:</td>
<td>1. COMMENT:</td>
<td>1. COMMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. RESPONSE</td>
<td>a. RESPONSE</td>
<td>a. RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"I have a plan: Attack!"1

- Your cover letter becomes the plan for how you will execute your revisions!
- Make a promise to yourself: Address one comment per day.
- It's OK to start with the easy ones!
- If you do this, most R&R’s will take you a month or less (Illustration #4)

1Iron Man (2012), The Avengers
Dear Dr. Levesque:

Thank you for the positive feedback regarding our manuscript, now entitled *The Longitudinal Consistency of Mother-Child Reporting Discrepancies of Parental Monitoring and their Ability to Predict Child Delinquent Behaviors Two Years Later*. We are very pleased that you have invited this manuscript for revision and resubmission in the *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. We are also very grateful for your helpful suggestions and those of the reviewers. Indeed, the comments allowed us to carefully rethink the discussion and interpretation of relevant literature in the Introduction, our analyses and evaluating alternative interpretations of the findings, and the relevance of the findings for adolescent development. Specifically, we have revised the Introduction and Discussion to better integrate prior work on informant discrepancies and their relevance to the adolescent development literature and parental monitoring. Moreover, we reported additional findings testing the relation between reporting discrepancies and child age both continuously and dichotomously (older versus younger youth), as well as variants of our main tests using either a continuous versus dichotomous age variable. Finally, in the Discussion we aimed to better integrate discussions of relevant literature in the Introduction and expanded upon the implications of our findings for future research. We have highlighted in yellow all of the text revisions. Permit us to describe our revisions and their scope:

Reviewer 2

1. We thank Reviewer 2 for noting that our manuscript “has important strengths, not the least of which are its use of strong measures and longitudinal data”
Pages 2-3. We thank Reviewer 2 for pointing us toward articles in the adolescent development literature that speak to issues of informant discrepancies. Indeed, much of the informant discrepancies work conducted in the last 20 years has been done specifically within examinations of parent-adolescent discrepancies in reports of each other’s behaviors, as empirical papers cited in past reviews of the literature attest (Achenbach et al., 1987, Psychological Bulletin; De Los Reyes & Kazdin, 2005, Psychological Bulletin). In light of these comments, rather than cite reviews on the broad topic of informant discrepancies research in child and adolescent assessments, we sought to focus more specifically on citing primary developmental and clinical research studies on informant discrepancies as observed in assessments of adolescents and their families. In so doing, we highlight that the phenomena of informant discrepancies is readily present in the assessment literatures dedicated to the measurement of adolescent behavior, in much the same way as informant discrepancies are observed across the psychological sciences. As Thomas Achenbach (2006) noted in a recent review, the observation of informant discrepancies represents one of the most robust observations in assessments of children, adolescents, and adults.

Arms

[Image: Funny Bone]
As In: Embrace Revision Process With Open Arms 😊

- Fix everything
- Do everything the reviewers and Editor tell you to do, but if you cannot fix everything...

What If You Can’t Fix Everything? 😞

- If you do not revise something as per commentary, you need a “solid gold” reason why you did not make the revision
  - Cite evidence to support your decision
  - Admit that you do not have the data to make the change, and highlight it as a limitation
- (Illustrations #5a-5c)
On p. 3, the authors note that "in the transition from childhood to adolescence, youth increasingly spend time outside of the home (Ingersoll, 1989)." They follow this point with the assertion that "in line with this transition, a key target for assessing and treating adolescent social anxiety involves maladaptive reactions to interacting with unfamiliar peers (Beidel, Rao, Scharfstein, Wong & Alfano, 2010)." It would be helpful if they went a bit further to demonstrate that the increased time children/adolescents spend outside the home is spent with others who are not already friends. As a parent and observer in 2018 (read: not an expert on adolescence or emerging adulthood, and not in 1989), I have noted a major trend for families to handle after-school hours for children by arranging activities with known acquaintances as opposed to allowing/encouraging their children to simply "go play" with others at some playground, park, etc., where they are likely to engage unfamiliar peers. I offer this suggestion mainly to encourage the authors to bolster what appears to be one of the authors' major bases for the current study's design of focusing on social anxiety experienced with unfamiliar peers.

a. **RESPONSE** Page 3. We provide additional support for the ideas noted by Reviewer 2:

i. "In fact, entire bodies of work on adolescent development focus on how this transition among adolescents to more time spent outside of the home (i.e., relative to younger children) often results in parents having relatively little knowledge of adolescents’ whereabouts, activities, and peer associations (i.e., parental monitoring; for reviews, see Racz & McMahon, 2011; Smetana, 2008)."
The authors' reference to "contextual" seemed to suggest that their consideration of context was broader/more than it actually was. For example, in the abstract, the authors note this: "However, not all adolescents find the same interactions distressing, necessitating a context-sensitive approach." I believe this statement is true, and important. However, in vivo behavioral scenarios offer many potentially meaningful aspects of context that have the ability to influence behavioral outcomes. In the current study, I noted that there was a disproportionately large percentage of African-American participants. One contextual variable involves a participant's identification of peers as (dis)similar. What was the racial identification of the confederates, and was any attempt made to examine the impact of matched versus dissimilar racial background? I presume it would not be feasible to actually race-match participants with confederates, but if the authors coded the variable, they might examine for a potential effect. Anyway, it seems to me that only one aspect of context was considered and therefore a more specific, consistent phrasing of "structured versus unstructured" would be helpful and more precise.

ii. Pages 23-24. Second, we highlight our specific focus on the structure of social interactions as a limitation of the study, and highlight directions for future research in light of this limitation:

1. "Fifth, in studying the social context of adolescents' interactions with unfamiliar peers, we focused on a specific element of this context, namely whether the social interaction was structured (e.g., public speaking; scripted role-playing scene) or unstructured (unscripted one-on-one conversation). Other elements of the social context could influence social anxiety, such as whether the unfamiliar peer confederates with whom adolescents interact consistently display a particular kind of interaction style (e.g., hostile vs. agreeable). Our social interaction paradigm is amenable to experimentally manipulating these elements of the social context. For instance, researchers could train peer confederates to interact with adolescent participants using a hostile or agreeable interaction style, and then conduct studies involving random assignment of adolescents to interactions with peer confederates who display a hostile versus agreeable interaction style. We encourage future research to leverage our approach to examine the impact of multiple aspects of the social context and their influence on adolescent social anxiety."
In part, I pose the above question because I am curious about power and the determination of sample size for the current study. I did not see coverage of these issues in the manuscript, and N = 89 is relatively modest for the sheer number of hypotheses, data points, and analyses involved. This is perhaps my biggest concern: The current submission attempts to achieve an awful lot, including the conduct of a number of multivariate analyses (e.g., the 66 correlations in Table 3), on the basis of a modest sample size—at least for correlational analyses and evaluating psychometric performance.

a. **RESPONSE.** We addressed this concern in three ways:

1. First, we agree with Reviewer 2 that we were ambitious in our approach to addressing study aims. Consequently, we removed all analyses pertaining to survey measures of safety behaviors and evaluative concerns. In this way, we streamlined the manuscript to focus exclusively on how independent observers’ ratings related to measures of social anxiety and arousal within social interactions.
ii. Second, we examined average effects observed within findings from each of our study aims. In Table 3, the absolute average magnitude of correlations was .34. In Table 4, the absolute average magnitude of Cohen’s $d$ was .61. In Tables 5-6, the absolute average magnitude of the $\beta$ of interest in the regression models was .30. In Tables 7-8, the absolute average magnitude of the $\beta$ of interest in the regression models was .41. In each of these instances, the effect, as per Cohen’s (1988) effect size conventions, would be considered “medium” in magnitude. Further, from a power standpoint a sample size of 89 was sufficient to detect medium-sized effects. For instance, in our revised version of Table 3, we reported 30 findings. Our post-hoc power estimate for the average effect of findings in this table (i.e., .34) was .92. Thus, we were well-powered to detect medium-sized effects with our sample. Given concerns with the length of the manuscript, we did not include these average estimates and power figures. However, we defer to the editorial team on this issue.

iii. Page 23. Third, we highlighted our sample size as a limitation of the study:

1. “Fourth, we addressed our study aims using a relatively modest sample size of 89 adolescents and their parents. The grand majority of our findings were in the “medium” range (i.e., $r = .30; d = 0.50$; see Cohen, 1988). With a sample size of 89 we were well-powered to detect effects at this magnitude. At the same time, we observed a handful of effects (see Tables 3 and 6) in the “small” range which we were statistically under-powered to detect. We encourage future research seeking to replicate and extend these findings to do so with larger samples.”
Hands

If You Need Help, Ask!

• Beyond your co-authors, there is nothing keeping you from asking colleagues for advice on revising your manuscript.
• It’s also OK to contact the Editor who handled your manuscript, but really only for questions that require their response.
• e.g., If I do not address Reviewer 2’s third comment, is that a “deal-breaker” for this manuscript?
Empathize With Your Reviewers

• A reviewer is reading your paper “pro bono”
• They’re like a free consultant or advisor on your manuscript
• They could be doing many other things with their time!
• Make things easy for them:
  o Highlight your revisions in the submitted manuscript
  o Note page numbers in cover letter
• (Illustrations #5d-5f)
Dear Andy:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript, "Trained Observers' Ratings of Adolescents' Social Anxiety and Social Skills within Controlled, Cross-Contextual Social Interactions with Unfamiliar Peer Confederates" to the Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment. I sent your manuscript to the same two experts who previously reviewed your manuscript. Reviewer 1 was generally satisfied with your revision. Reviewer 2 was generally satisfied but also raised a concern about the combining of samples that needs further consideration. Reviewer 2 raises the important point that combining the samples could affect your findings and that more needs to be done to determine that it is appropriate to combine them. In addition, if there are a number of papers using this data set can you help contextualize the unique contribution of this paper. Thanks for your attention to these concerns raised by the reviewers. If possible, please submit your revised paper within 60 days. If you need additional time, please let me know. I will look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

Randall T. Saikin
Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment

5. Regarding the decision to pool the two samples (clinic-referred and community control adolescents) for correlational data analysis: The authors noted that they found non-significant differences with regard to demographic characteristics. This supports their decision if certain demographic variables (e.g., sex) are potential confounds—for example, when considering whether to pool two samples of otherwise similar participants (e.g., two samples of students from different institutions)—but that is not the concern I meant to raise. Unless I am mistaken, in order to justify performing a single analysis on pooled data from two different populations, it would be more meaningful to examine for evidence of distributional similarity. For example, is it only the mean levels of the SIAS that are expected to differ or are the variances also unique? Does the SIAS allow for a similar range of scores/expression at different points along a social anxiety symptom severity continuum (e.g., clinically anxious versus control respondents)? If not, then inspection of the scatterplots may reveal distributions that should not be pooled. For performing the correlations in Table 3, I think it is prudent to examine the distributions empirically. I’m not certain if this is the best resource to offer, but the authors may find it helpful.

a. **RESPONSE** We addressed Reviewer 2’s remaining concern in three ways:

i. **Page 15.** First, we now include in our Data-Analytic Plan a set of preliminary analyses designed to inspect any large changes in magnitudes of correlations reported in Table 3, when those same correlations were conducted as partial correlations that controlled for adolescents’ referral status. This is an approach taken in recent work (i.e., Powers & Powers, 2015) that sought to address the issues raised by article noted by Reviewer 2 in the previous round of commentary (i.e., Hassler & Thadewald, 2003):

1. “Our preliminary analyses also involved providing additional justification for taking a pooled sample approach to addressing some of our research aims, as recommended by others (Hassler & Thadewald, 2003; Powers & Powers, 2015). Specifically, we inspected the range of correlations between our survey reports and independent observers’ ratings (see Table 3), relative to the range of partial correlations that controlled for adolescents’ referral status.”

ii. **Pages 17-18.** Second, we report the findings of the preliminary analyses described on page 15:

1. “We also inspected the range of correlations between our survey reports and independent observers’ ratings (Table 3), relative to the range of partial correlations that controlled for adolescents’ referral status. As seen in Table 3, correlations between SPAIC and SIAS reports and independent observers’ anxiety ratings ranged from low-to-large (.25 to .58), based on Cohen’s (1988) effect size conventions. Similarly, correlations between SPAIC and SIAS reports and independent observers’ social skills ratings ranged from low-to-large (-.17 to -.55). Partial correlations controlling for adolescents’ referral status also revealed low-to-large ranges of correlations between SPAIC and SIAS reports and independent observers’ anxiety ratings (.13 to .54), and social skills ratings (-.07 to -.52). Further, the direction of the relation (i.e., positive vs. negative) for each partial correlation was the same as the direction of that same correlation as reported in Table 3. Thus, these preliminary analyses did not reveal any changes in magnitudes of correlations that were substantial enough to rule out taking a pooled sample approach to addressing some of our research aims.”
iii. Tables 9 and 10. Third, in tests of our key aim of examining contextual variations in independent observers’ ratings of adolescent social anxiety and social skills we both controlled for adolescents’ referral status and tested the interaction between referral status and social context. In each of these tests, the interaction between referral status and social context was non-significant, indicating that the effects we observed were consistent for adolescents in our sample, regardless of referral status.
As In: Your Eye For Detail Should Kick Into Overdrive!

- In the final stages of your revisions, “dot your i’s” and “cross your t’s”
- Also, obsessively check those damn i’s and t’s!!
- Editors and reviewers see typo’s and grammatical errors as a marker for the quality of the work
- Tiny errors = sloppy work

Part IV:
Smaller (but very special) points on the map
Guts

“We would be pleased to make any further revisions.”

• Peer review = war of attrition
• You always want to make the Editor know that you are in this until the end
• You will fix this paper until they give up and say “accept”
• It takes guts to state this explicitly, but if you do you will get the benefit of the doubt during the review process
• (Illustration #6)
Thank you for the encouragement, support, and feedback that you and the reviewers have provided. Whether the manuscript is ultimately accepted or not, the comments helped us clarify key issues, and allowed us to better convey the study’s findings and their contributions to adolescent development. Thank you for considering the manuscript further. We look forward to hearing from you. Needless to say, we would be quite pleased to make any further revisions.

Soul
Be A Good Academic Citizen

- Just like others reviewed your work for free, return the favor and agree to review manuscripts
- Most importantly: Accept review requests from the journals where you publish
- Also, OK to email Editors and let them know that you are available to review (attach your CV to email)

Wishbone
What If Two Reviewers Provide Conflicting Advice?!

• Those are the easiest ones to address!
• “Reviewer X suggested A. This was inconsistent with Reviewer Y suggesting B. After much thought, we decided to [INSERT THE ONE YOU WOULD RATHER DO 😊]
As In: “I would give you my kidney for more time!”

- Good news! You get to keep your kidney 😊
- Just ask!
- Email the Editor, and ask for more time, they usually say yes!

Take a Guess
Sometimes You Catch a Mean Reviewer

• Important: No one takes a “Reviewer Class”
• Reviewers are like anyone: Some just have bad days
• If it’s particularly nasty, let the Editor know
• Useful for you and Editor
• (Illustration #7)

With regard to the reviewers, we are eager to address their helpful comments. For the most part, we were pleased with the constructive commentary. We believe that by addressing the commentary the result will be a far stronger manuscript than the version initially submitted for consideration.

However, we were quite surprised to see the overall tone of Reviewer 2’s commentary. Indeed, much of the commentary was quite incendiary (e.g., “In this regard, the manuscript absolutely misses the boat.”) and by the reviewer’s own admission, they did not carefully read the manuscript (e.g., “Given the above issues, I have not read the rest.”). Finally, Reviewer 2 even went so far as to advocate for a particular editorial decision within their commentary to us (e.g., “The manuscript would need to start the review process from scratch given the severe limitations of the current version.”). Needless to say, each of us was quite taken aback and in some respects offended by Reviewer 2’s commentary.

In any event, we simply wanted to raise to you our concerns with the manner in which some of the commentary was conveyed to us. We welcome any thoughts that you might have on these issues and thank you very much for your kind and prompt attention to this manuscript. Take care.
Like Your Last Guess, But Worse

So…You Have a Frenemy

- Important: Reviewers leave fingerprints
- Sometimes comments give a reviewer’s identity away
  - They tell you: “Cite me more!”
  - They hate your theoretical frame because it’s not the one they use
  - They do not like your measures because they are not the measures they use
- What do you do if you discover that a reviewer is consistently unfair to you?
Call The Bouncer 😊

• In your cover letter, you can select a “not reviewer”
• Request that the Editor not invite a reviewer to evaluate your manuscript
• Cite philosophical differences
• Important: Take some of the blame!
• (Illustration #8)

Due to scholarly conflicts of interest, I respectfully request that Drs. XXXX (XXXX) and XXXX (XXXX) not serve as reviewers on this manuscript. The philosophical differences between Drs. XXXX and XXXX and I prevent any one of us from providing objective evaluations of each other’s work. In fact, as a general rule I decline to review any manuscript submitted for publication in which I suspect that either Drs. XXXX or XXXX are authors on the manuscript.

I am aware that identifying reviewers with a conflict of interest may increase the difficulty in identifying suitable reviewers. Thus, I am happy to provide names of reviewers who are knowledgeable of the manuscript’s primary area of focus and can provide a fair evaluation of the work: XXXX (XXXX), XXXX (XXXX), XXXX (XXXX), and XXXX (XXXX).
Broken Heart

What If an Editor Rejects Your Revised Manuscript?

• Tough one: 9 times out of 10, you should move on
  o Remember “Brain (Part I)” and let it sit for a few days
  o After, ask yourself: Should I fight this one and see if I can go back?
  o Is this paper worth fighting for?

• Second question is very important: Easy for a “fight” to turn into a bad reflection on you
How Do You “Move On”?  

- Go back and read the reviews  
- Was there a “deal-breaker” comment that you could not successfully address?  
- If “yes” this might mean that you should shoot for a “lower-tier” journal  
- **Important:** Do not give up on the paper, unless you encounter some “extraordinary evidence” that you should give up!

---

I promise to take final questions in a moment, but first....