[Access provided at 26 Apr 2023 11:58 GMT with no institutional affiliation]

Supplementary Materials

Peer review in linguistics journals: Best practices and emerging standards: Survey to linguistics journal editors

ALEXANDRA D'ARCY

University of Victoria

JOSEPH SALMONS

University of Wisconsin – Madison

Q1 Dear fellow editors of Linguistics journals,

We are interested how you see current reviewing practices versus what you would like to see. That is, we are trying to contrast current practice in the review process with best practice in our field. Our intention is to write a “state of the art” article for submission to a journal—we are currently thinking about the Commentaries section of *Language*.

We have compiled some questions to help us get at this. Some are designed to give us a sense of current practice. Others are aimed at assessing what is working and how things might be improved.

We appreciate that completing this questionnaire will take some time. We estimate ca.15 minutes but a really engaged response could take longer. You don't have to answer all the questions, and you certainly don't have to answer them in great detail. Some text boxes are to allow comments where your journal may have particular structures or practices. We appreciate any responses you give us. (If you use an online submission manager like EM or ScholarOne, you can generate exact answers to some of the questions, if you want.)

Because this work is concerned with professional practice, we have confirmed that it is exempt from REB/IRB oversight. That said, we do not plan to identify anyone or any journal by name and will attempt to use quotes that do not allow identification. It would be helpful for us if you could let us know which journal you edit and how you would categorize it. That will allow us to try to sort out any effects of field, or specialization, and it is information we would not reveal to others (though we do expect to report on the kinds of journals that are represented in

our overview, as that will provide important context for our arguments). If you prefer not to provide that level of detail, we understand.

If you have an editorial position with more than one journal, we ask that you respond from the perspective of your main journal. Of course, if you are very eager, we have no objection to you doing the survey more than once, each time for a different journal that you are affiliated with.

The questionnaire is available by simply clicking to continue.

If you know of an editor who isn't on this listserv, please forward the survey link to them. Please feel free to contact either of us if you have questions about any of this, or if you have comments to share beyond what is available in the questionnaire.

Thanks in advance,

Alex D'Arcy and Joe Salmons

adarcy@uvic.ca | jsalmons@wisc.edu

Q2 What journal do you (co-) edit, if you're willing to say? (This is simply for us and won't be included in anything we produce from the project.)

Q4 Is it a specialist or general linguistics journal? ('Specialist' may mean in terms of a subfield or language or family.)

☐ Specialist

☐ General

Q5 If it's specialist-oriented, what subfield(s) or language(s) or families would you identify it with?

Q6 How many years experience do you have editing linguistics journals? (Please think of this as total editorial experience, including experience as Assistant Editor, Associate Editor, or Co-Editor.)

- ☐ 2 or less
- ☐ 2-4
- ☐ 4-6
- ☐ 6-8
- ☐ 8-10
- ☐ 10+

Q7 Do you use an online editorial system (like Editorial Manager, ScholarOne, etc.)

- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
-

Q8 If so, how well do you like it? (If no, please skip this question.)

- ☐ Like a great deal
 - ☐ Like a moderate amount
 - ☐ Like a little
 - ☐ Neither like nor dislike
 - ☐ Dislike a little
 - ☐ Dislike a moderate amount
 - ☐ Dislike a great deal
-

Q9 Beyond the main editor or co-editors, how many members of your editorial team are involved in a given decision? For instance, do you have associate editors who take on decisions? Does an entire team read and discuss draft decisions or some subset?

- ☐ 0
 - ☐ 1
 - ☐ 2
 - ☐ 3
 - ☐ 4
 - ☐ 5 or more
-

Q45 Other comments on involvement in the process?

Q10 How many reviewers do you typically invite for a given manuscript?

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4 or more

Q35 How many of those reviewers are typically from your editorial board or editorial team?

- ☐ 0 (board members/editorial team members don't review papers)
- ☐ 0 (board members/editorial team members are used selectively, e.g. for tricky cases, for resubmissions where an original reviewer has declined the invitation to re-review, etc.)
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2 or more

Q11 How much time do you give reviewers to respond to your initial invitation? Do you send reminders, and if so, at what interval(s)?

Q12 Is review anonymous or double-anonymous?

- ☐ Neither
 - ☐ Anonymous
 - ☐ Double anonymous
-

Q13 How much time do you give reviewers to complete their review?

- ☐ 2 weeks or less
 - ☐ 2-4 weeks
 - ☐ 4-8 weeks
 - ☐ 8-10 weeks
 - ☐ More than 10 weeks
-

Q37 What's the typical time from initial submission to an editorial decision (desk rejections aside)?

- ☐ 1 month or less
- ☐ 1-2 months
- ☐ 2-3 months
- ☐ 3-5 months
- ☐ More than 5 months

Q14 About what percentage of reviewers complete reviews on time (by which we mean, by the set deadline)?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Q15 About what percentage of reviewers fail to submit a review?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Q16 About what percentage of reviewers fail to respond to the invitation to review?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Q17 For reviewers who submit reviews on time, do they typically submit their reviews in advance of the deadline (e.g. a week or more before the deadline) or close to/at/within a day or two after the deadline? (answers must add up to 100%)

in advance of the deadline : _____

close to the deadline : _____

Total : _____

Q18 Do you send copies of the decision letter to reviewers?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q19 Can or do reviewers see the other review(s)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q43 If you request a letter from authors about revisions they have made to address reviewer comments, do you share that letter with reviewers who are invited to read the new submission?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ We don't request that

Q33 Do you provide reviewers specific instructions for how to structure their reviews?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q20 What is the typical length of a review?

- ☐ Under a page
- ☐ 1-2 pages
- ☐ 2 or more pages
-

Q21 Do you expressly elicit a range of perspectives from reviewers of a given paper (e.g., one reviewer who may be familiar with the methods or data, one who is an expert in the theoretical framework, one who can provide a general perspective)

Q22 How do you control for ‘bad apple’ reviewers? What level of negativity do you tolerate?
How do you resolve the problem of overly negative reviews?

Q23 Have you ever held a review back from an author? Why or why not?

Q24 Do you have a specific way to check on data and quantitative or other technical aspects?

Q44 What is the role of the editor for your journal? For this question, we are interested in the following kinds of information: Who writes decision letters? How long are decision letters? Does an editor add their own comments/feedback, or do they rely wholly on the reviewers? In other words, how involved is an editor in the decision process?

Q27 In other fields (e.g. Anthropology, Economics), studies have reported low levels of agreement between reviewers. What is your general sense about this for your journal, specifically in these three ways:

1. Do reviewers generally agree on their recommendation (e.g. major revision)?

- ☐ More often than not, they make the same recommendation or the recommendations are similar (e.g. major revision vs. minor revision)
- ☐ Their recommendations are generally quite similar
- ☐ It's about 50/50 agree vs. do not agree (e.g. reject vs. minor revision)
- ☐ There is relatively little agreement between reviewers
- ☐ More often than not, there is no agreement between reviewers

Q38 2. How much overlap, consistency, or thematic parallelism is there between reviews?

- ☐ An overwhelming amount
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ Only a little
- ☐ None at all

Q39 3. How much agreement and how much overlap would you expect, and why?

Q46 Further comments on agreement or disagreement among reviewers?

Q28 Do you feel that any aspect of the review process is arbitrary? If yes, which one(s)?

Q29 In your view, what are the key elements of a good review?

Q30 What are the most helpful aspects of a review? That is, how can reviewers most effectively help both authors and editors?

Q31 If your journal allows for confidential comments to the editor, what kind of information is better presented here (rather than to authors)? What kind of feedback is particularly helpful to you, but may be less so for authors?

Q32 In your view, what are the biggest mistakes that reviewers make? What types of things should reviewers avoid doing?

Q34 If different from the above, what are the least helpful things that you come across in reviews?

Q26 What would you like to see reviewers do better?

Q25 Do you think the review process could be improved? If yes, how so?

Q36 Any other comments on the review process for linguistics journals?

Q47 Last but not least, we'd like to get a sense of acceptance rates. We appreciate that for this question you may have to come up with some estimates, and that's perfectly reasonable.

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

What percent of first submissions do you accept (assuming revision but no further external review)?
What percent of re-submissions do you accept?