



Peer Review in JCIR

Rengarajan Rajagopal¹

¹ Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

J Clin Interv Radiol ISVIR 2024;8:141–142.

Address for correspondence Rengarajan Rajagopal, MD, DM, EBIR, Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Basni Industrial Phase II, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, 342005, India (e-mail: heraghava@gmail.com).

Editor,

Peer review is used to assess the quality of a manuscript before it is published. Independent researchers in the relevant research area assess the manuscripts submitted to a journal for originality, validity, and significance to help editors make an informed decision about whether the manuscript should be published in their journal. Journal editors usually assume that they can recruit skilled reviewers to guide their decision-making effort and that reviewers will do a meticulous job and take the time to do this unpaid, usually unsung work.

It is usually considered a privilege to review the works of our colleagues and to look at the relevance and scientific merit of the works.¹ The manuscripts submitted are usually at the cutting edge of the specific research area, and those that are finally published are the best of the manuscripts submitted for consideration. Thus, a reviewer has the opportunity to read and consider varied new perspectives, ultimately giving considerable educational value to the review process. A reviewer's skills may be sharpened considerably by reading each new manuscript, both excellent and less than excellent manuscripts. This also helps them to understand how their own work could be crafted to avoid the problems observed in the less worthy manuscripts.

On the corollary, journal editors expect reviewers to write reviews that are instructive to the authors and helpful to decide whether the manuscript is worthy to be published. Replacing “sharp” comments and “casual” dismissals with thoughtful and constructive feedback on how the manuscript

can be improved can be vital.¹ Several journals like *Journal of Vascular Interventional Radiology (JVIR)* and *Cardiovascular and Interventional Radiology (CVIR)* and societies such as the Indian Society of Vascular and Interventional Radiology (ISVIR) have been conducting onsite training sessions during annual conferences to educate their reviewer base and improve the quality of reviews. Post-COVID, there is a paradigm shift and need for such events to become virtual.

To assess the interest and enthusiasm among interventional radiologists in India with regard to peer review and critical appraisal, an online survey form was created and circulated among the ISVIR members. Ninety-four responses were received, of which 94% were from India and the rest from SAARC countries and other nations. Of the total responders, 32% were already reviewers for our journal. A lesser proportion (23%) of responders were reviewers for other interventional radiology (IR) related journals. Of all respondents, 16% were residents in radiology or fellows in IR, and a higher percentage (51%) were early-career interventional radiologists who wished to acquire critical appraisal knowledge and learn the processes to improve practice. Fewer than 33% of the responders reviewed and critically appraised manuscripts at a frequency of once a month or higher. About 50% of respondents reviewed or appraised studies at a frequency lower than once in 3 months. Approximately 95% of the survey participants were interested in attending virtual and onsite peer events relating to article review and critical appraisal.

We propose to conduct such peer events in the near future to encourage future reviewers to engage in this fascinating and privileged role, to enhance scholarship, and to contribute to the betterment of our journal and the IR community as a whole.

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Reference

- 1 Rosenbaum P. On the value of being a journal reviewer. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2005;47(03):147