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Scholarly Feedback: Enough Already!

- **Purpose**: Creating bodies of knowledge
  - ”Academic writing in particular calls upon writers not simply to express their own idea, but to do so as a response to what others have said.” (Graff & Birkenstein, They Say I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing)

- **Contexts**: Mentor, Milestone Committees, Journal Editors, Grant Reviewers

- **Format**: Written and Verbal

- **Moving forward**: Climbing out from underneath your desk
Responding to Feedback: Mentors and Committee Members

- Feedback from mentors.
  - Mentor: Timing, format, depth of detail
  - Mentee: Appreciative, responsive proactive

- Committees’ roles in the thesis and dissertation processes.
  - Level of engagement
  - Prospectus versus defense
  - Follow up communications
Why Peer Review

Peer review allows your research to be evaluated and commented upon by independent experts (your ‘peers’) who work within the same academic field as you. Its aims are to:

- Ensure submitted articles are suitable for the journal and its readers.
- Give you detailed and constructive feedback on your work from experts in the field.
- Alerts you to any errors or gaps in literature you may have overlooked.
- Create a discussion between the author, reviewers, and editor around a research field or topic.

The Peer Review Process

1. **Editor receives manuscript**
2. **Checks the article fits the journal’s aims and scope**
3. **Reviewers are selected and receive the paper**
4. **Reviewers provide editor with comments, suggestions and a recommendation**
5. **Comments and suggestions are reviewed by the editor and given to the author**
6. **Amendments are made**
7. **Proofing and production**
8. **Article published**

Responding to Feedback: Journal & Book Editors

- Revise and Resubmit
  - Read
  - Digest
  - Organize
  - Respond and Revise
  - What to do when you disagree with a reviewer (justification)

- Reject
  - Read
  - Digest
  - Consider alternative-fatally flawed (lack of importance of inappropriate design) vs. salvageable
  - Revise
Summary

- **DO**
  - Take a break but stay within the timeline
  - Consult as needed
  - Point-by-point responses
  - Well-reasoned arguments supported by data or citations
  - Mind your tone and show appreciation

- **DON’T**
  - Argue every point
  - Interpret reviews as personal attacks
  - Avoid combative phrases
Questions