Conclusions

Of the journals surveyed, few offer training, yet most perceive a need for training. It is not clear where the responsibility for reviewer training should lie (see Figure 3) or what, in fact, constitutes reviewer training.

There are consequences for the quality of peer review if no one is engaged in training. There is no simple answer to the question of how peer review training is defined. “Reviewer training” can be broadly interpreted. It could be as simple as a general how-to (technical training on the editorial system; how to submit a review); to training on how to review the clinical and/or methodological sections of a paper; to general “how to peer review”—a complete overview of the peer review process. The technical “how-to” is presumably part of EO services. The deeper level training on how to perform a comprehensive peer review may go beyond the scope of the EO’s knowledge base. This training is harder to define and opinions differ on how people access this training (see Figure 1).
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