



# TAA Committee for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Town Hall on Peer Review

Presented by TAA's Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  
September 21, 2021  
4-5PM ET



# TAA Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Laura Frost, Chair  
Steve Barkan  
Dione Taylor  
Stacie DeFreitas



Nicole Dillard  
Shawn Nordell  
Sumor Sheppard



Brian Shmaefsky  
Pilar Wyman  
Michael Spinella, *ex-officio*



# Peer Review Week 2021 - The Role of Identity

- Global Event
- Annual event led by individuals from 50 academic publishers, institutions, societies, and researchers
- Different focus each year regarding peer review
- 2021 - Highlights the role of personal and social identity in peer review and ways the scholarly community can foster more diverse, equitable, and inclusive peer review practices



See <https://peerreviewweek.wordpress.com/peer-review-week-2021/>



# TAA Town Hall on Identity in Peer Review

## Overview:

- Define identity in peer review
- Introduce issues in peer review that relate to identity
- Discuss (breakout rooms) identity and peer review from two perspectives:
  - Author's perspective
  - Reviewer's perspective
- Recommendations for TAA Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee in regards to peer review



# Identity encompasses the values people hold

What defines identity?

- Identity encompasses the values people hold, which dictate the choices they make.
- An identity contains multiple roles—such as a mother, teacher, and nation of origin—and each role holds meaning and expectations that are internalized into one's identity.
- Identity continues to evolve over the course of an individual's life.

Goal Today: The role of personal, professional, and cultural identity in peer review

From: <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/identity>



# Our identity can affect peer review of our work

## Professional identity as an author:

- Institution identity (Humanities - Wellmon & Piper, 2017)
- Prestige of author (Medicine - Okike, et al 2016)

## Social identity as an author:

- Gender (Ecology - Fox and Paine 2019) and (Humanities - Wellmon and Piper, 2017)
- Disproportionate harm of comments to underrepresented groups (gender, sexuality, race/ethnicity)(STEM- Silbiger & Stubler, 2019)

# Our identity can affect our peer review of colleague's work

Identity in Peer Review - “reviewer bias is understood as the violation of impartiality in the evaluation of a submission” (Lee et al. 2012)

## Professional identity as a reviewer:

- Discipline affects toughness of review (Lee and Schunn 2011)
- Confirmation bias (Ernst, Resch, and Uher 1992) and Conservatism bias (Braben 2004)

## Social Identity as a reviewer:

- Women underrepresented on editorial boards of journals (Cho et al 2014)
- Nation of origin can affect reviewer tone (Wood 1997, Marsh et al. 2008)



# Discussion Time - Breakout Rooms:

## 1) **Author perspective - getting unbiased reviews (experiences and suggestions)**

Questions:

- Have you experienced bias as an author?
- When you select a journal or request (textbook or journal) reviewers, what do you look for?

## 2) **Reviewer/Editor perspective - academic or publisher - selecting/requesting reviewers (experiences and suggestions)**

Questions:

- Have you experienced bias as a reviewer or editor (of textbook or journal)?
- As a reviewer/editor, how do you ensure that your identity doesn't affect your review?





# REFERENCES

- Robyn M. Borsuk, Lonnie W. Aarssen, Amber E. Budden, Julia Koricheva, Roosa Leimu, Tom Tregenza, Christopher J. Lortie, To Name or Not to Name: The Effect of Changing Author Gender on Peer Review, *BioScience*, Volume 59, Issue 11, December 2009, Pages 985–989, <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2009.59.11.10>
- Braben, D.W. (2004). *Pioneering research: A risk worth taking*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Interscience.
- Cho AH, Johnson SA, Schuman CE, Adler JM, Gonzalez O, Graves SJ, Huebner JR, Marchant DB, Rifai SW, Skinner I, Bruna EM. 2014. Women are underrepresented on the editorial boards of journals in environmental biology and natural resource management. *PeerJ* 2:e542 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.542>
- Ernst E, Resch KL, Uher EM. Reviewer bias. *Ann Intern Med*. 1992 Jun 1;116(11):958. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-116-11-958\_2. PMID: 1580460.
- Fox CW, Paine CET. Gender differences in peer review outcomes and manuscript impact at six journals of ecology and evolution. *Ecol Evol*. 2019 Mar 4;9(6):3599-3619. doi: 10.1002/ece3.4993. PMID: 30962913; PMCID: PMC6434606.
- Helmer M, Schottdorf M, Neef A, Battaglia D. Gender bias in scholarly peer review. *Elife*. 2017 Mar 21;6:e21718. doi: 10.7554/eLife.21718. PMID: 28322725; PMCID: PMC5360442.
- Lee, C.J., & Schunn, C.D. (2011). Social biases and solutions for procedural objectivity. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 26(2), 352–373.
- Lee, Carole & Sugimoto, Cassidy & Freeman, Guo & Cronin, Blaise. (2013). Bias in peer review. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*. 64. 10.1002/asi.22784.
- Marsh HW, Jayasinghe UW, Bond NW. Improving the peer-review process for grant applications: reliability, validity, bias, and generalizability. *Am Psychol*. 2008 Apr;63(3):160-8. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.160. PMID: 18377106.
- Okike K, Hug KT, Kocher MS, Leopold SS. Single-blind vs Double-blind Peer Review in the Setting of Author Prestige. *JAMA*. 2016;316(12):1315–1316. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.11014
- Silbiger, N. J., & Stubler, A. D. (2019). Unprofessional peer reviews disproportionately harm underrepresented groups in STEM. *PeerJ*, 7, e8247. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8247>
- Wellmon, C. & Piper, A. (2017). Publication, Power, and Patronage: On Inequality and Academic Publishing. *Critical Inquiry*. [https://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/publication\\_power\\_and\\_patronage\\_on\\_inequality\\_and\\_academic\\_publishing/](https://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/publication_power_and_patronage_on_inequality_and_academic_publishing/)
- Wood, F.Q. (1997). *The peer review process*. Canberra, Australia: National Board of Employment, Education and Training.