

Remarks on Reviewing

Christian Kuehn

January 1, 2016

Dear Editor,

this document contains a few remarks regarding reviewing if you think about contacting me for a peer-review of a paper (or a book). I would appreciate if you could take them into account. *Thank you!*

1. **General:** Overall, I believe reviewing is a critical, important and valuable experience. I am happy to review manuscripts for a wide variety of journals and publishers.
2. **Requests:** Please note that I get *a lot* of requests. I reviewed around 20 papers per year during the last few years, which is already slightly too much. Therefore, if I decline a request, it is common that I have to decline it to save time for those reviews I currently have to finish and to keep a high quality standard.
3. **Topics:** I am more inclined to do a review for a paper where I can see that there are very few other reviewers, who could do it. In particular, this situation often occurs for *multidisciplinary* papers, or research *bridging between* different methods and areas as my own research is relatively broad.
4. **Deadlines:** I do not feel comfortable to review a mathematical paper in less than 6 weeks and a more application-oriented/modelling/data-analysis paper in less than 3 weeks; if the papers are very long (≥ 30 pages, approximately), the time should be doubled. You should have very good reasons to set shorter deadlines.
5. **Re-Reviews:** I find looking at, and commenting on, revised versions useful. However, I am going to decline to comment on revisions from now on, where the authors *have not made the effort* to answer each of my questions and suggestions in a point-by-point reply.
6. **Publishers I:** If the publisher for the journal requesting a review from me has been identified as *predatory* or otherwise *dubious*, I am not going to review for the journal; this should *not be interpreted* as a statement with respect to the editor, the authors, or the scientific quality of the paper but purely as a statement against the publisher.
7. **Publishers II:** If the publisher has *very extensive profit margins*, monopolistic pricing or strange access policies, I may decline to review for such publishers and/or prioritize reviewing for university-run or scientific-society-run journals.
8. **Content-Focus:** My reviews are usually very much focusing on trying to improve the scientific quality of the work and the journal. Therefore, if you find 'one-liners' particularly helpful, it is not a good idea to contact me as a referee.