Thank you for all you do as a reviewer for *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* and *PRS Global Open*. We never forget that you are donating your time, enthusiasm, and great expertise to your peers so our Journal will continue to enhance our specialty worldwide.
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I. General Tips: Agreeing & Submitting

The following reminders and strategies will help us to continue to provide the best possible peer reviews to the authors and your peers.

- Agree to review or Decline to review **within 2-3 business days** when possible.

- There is **no need to agree to review every paper.**
  - It’s better to get a “no” quickly, rather than no response.

- If you find yourself declining more reviews than you accept, let us know so that we can better match papers to your areas of expertise.

- When declining the invitation to review, please include a reason as to why.
  - Especially if we have misjudged your areas of interest or expertise

- If you do agree to write the review, continue to submit it on time or ahead of time.

- If 7 days have passed after you accept the assignment, and you still plan on submitting the review before the 14-day period expires, contact the editorial staff so we can give you more time at bharpers@plasticsurgery.org

- When an article’s status changes to “**Required Reviews Complete,”** it indicates that two reviews have come in.
  - That status is a good indicator that Dr. Rohrich might be able to make a decision on the paper soon.
  - Please submit your review soon after that status change
  - If you need more time, please let the editorial staff know at bharpers@plasticsurgery.org
II. Content of the Review

- Peer review is **essential** and is the cornerstone of PRS. A good review offers a **summary** to the editor-in-chief and more importantly, **critique** the merits of the article. Some key questions are below as well as examples of a good/poor review.
  - Is this appropriate for PRS or PRS Global Open?
  - Is the topic interesting or original?
  - Were the author’s methods ethical?
  - Can you suggest a better way to address the issue than what the authors did?
  - Do the figures/tables add to the paper?
  - Would you cite this paper if published?
  - Does the data back up the author’s findings?
  - Are there fatal flaws in the paper?

- **Comments are Key**: Please note that a review without ‘comments to the editor’ or ‘comments to the author’ is not useful in the decision-making process for the editor or the revision process for the author.

- **Meaningful, Constructive Comments**: Be sure to posit your critiques to the author in a constructive format. There is no purpose for negativity or mean-spiritedness. Constructive comments should aim to help the author improve their paper, whether it winds up in *PRS, PRS Global Open*, or another journal altogether.
  - **Inflammatory, insulting** comments are not allowed

- **Question 11**: Please make sure that you answer question 11, which asks you to rank the article against other articles you’ve read.

- **The Peer-Reviewer’s Golden Rule**: “Review unto others as you would have them review unto you”

- **Further Reading**: Please read the following *PRS* articles:
III. Earning CME Credit by reviewing for PRS

Did you know that you can earn CME credits by reviewing for PRS? This feature goes hand-in-hand with providing a good review. Here is how the process works:

- Agree to a review invitation from PRS
- Submit your review by the deadline provided in the invitation
- Follow the keys to providing a great review provided in section 2

Once your review has been submitted the review is graded by the Editorial Staff and the Editor-in-Chief before the comments are sent to the authors.

- Reviews Graded > 70 are eligible for CME credit.
  - **CME Eligible Review Example**
    - In this review, the reviewer answered question #11, gave honest comments and concerns about the manuscript to the Editor, and gave meaningful, constructive comments to the Authors without being negative.
    - This reviewer also suggested in the Comments to the Editor that a statistician review the manuscript. If you are uncertain about the stats of an article but statistical analysis is outside your expertise, we would be more than happy to send it to one of our bio-statisticians.
    - Our goal is to inform the author on what will make their manuscript a stronger submission. This not only benefits the authors, but those who will be reading their paper.

- Reviews Graded < 70 are not eligible for CME credit.
  - **CME Non-Eligible Review Example 1**
    - “Recommendation only.”
    - The reviewer did recommend “revise” in this review, but did not answer any of the questions, and did not give any comments to the Editor or the Authors. A review like this does not let the Editorial Staff and Dr. Rohrich know why the reviewer made the decision they did. We would be unable to use this review in making a final decision about this manuscript.

- **CME Non-Eligible Review Example 2**
  - “Insufficient commentary.”
  - If we were to receive a review that answers all the questions, but under Editor comments says “I feel like manuscript would be better suited in PRS Global Open,” we would be unable to use the review. While we appreciate the comment, we do not have any information as to why the reviewer recommends the manuscript be sent to PRS Global Open, rather than revised for PRS.
  - We also need comments to the Author. These comments are important because they help the Authors understand why we have
made our decision regarding their manuscript, and help them improve their paper.

- CME Non-Eligible Review Example 3
  - "Inflammatory, insulting comments."
  - The review is not constructive if it berates the authors or questions their intelligence, motivations, or character. These comments could have been said much more constructively.
  - If you have serious concerns about the manuscript, but fear they may verge on insulting or accusatory, express those type of comments in the “confidential comments to editor” section.

- See some additional examples of credit-bearing and non-credit bearing peer reviews here.
  - Review Example 1
  - Review Example 2
  - Review Example 3

Reviewers can earn 3 AMA PRA Category 1 Credits per each satisfactory peer review he or she completes.
IV. Classifications and Specialties

The best way to ensure that you are receiving invitations for articles in your area of expertise is to update your personal classifications. This is a feature in Enkwell that once populated by you will help to match reviewers by topical subject area. This will allow us to link manuscripts to reviewers with greater accuracy, and more evenly distribute the workload. To update your classifications follow these steps:

1. Log in to your Enkwell account and select UPDATE MY INFORMATION (if you do not know your credentials please contact the Editorial office at prs_mailbox@plasticsurgery.org)

2. Scroll to the bottom of this window and you will see the section labeled AREA OF INTEREST OR EXPERTISE. Here you can select your personal classifications and rank them, if you desire.
3. Click Submit when you are done to save your changes
4. If your areas of expertise do not appear satisfactorily on the list, please contact the Editorial Office at bharper_prs@plasticsurgery.org
V. How to add “Unavailable Dates” in Enkwell

Many times a reviewer will decline a review because they will be out of town, or will have limited time due to other duties. To ensure that we do not invite you when you are unable to review we ask that you please add the days you will be unavailable to your profile. You will then be listed as “Unavailable”, and the Editor-in-Chief and the editorial staff will find someone else to review the manuscript.

To add “Unavailable Dates”:

1. Log in to your Enkwell account and select UPDATE MY INFORMATION (if you do not know your credentials please contact the Editorial office at bharper_prs@plasticsurgery.org)

2. Under “Additional Information” you will find an “Unavailable Dates” button, click on the button.

3. Click on the link that says “Add New Unavailable Dates”.

---

![Enkwell User Interface](image-url)
4. You will then fill in the information of which dates you will be unable to review, and the reason you will be unavailable.
5. You may also fill in “Substitute Information” if you have someone you feel could provide a timely, unbiased review for the Journal, but this is not required information.
VI. Automatic Date Reminders

We also offer automatic reminder invitations. This feature is included in all reviewer invitations and is a mail attachment that automatically links email programs such as iCal or Outlook Exchange. Once linked to your email program you will receive reminders regarding your due date. To utilize this feature follow the steps below:

- After receiving the reviewer invitation select “AGREE TO REVIEW”
- You should receive another email with the attachment. Click the attachment and save the appointment to the email program of your choice.

If you have any questions about the process you can always contact the Editorial Office and they can walk you through the process.

We thank you for your contribution to Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery and look forward to working with you.
VII. Reviewer Statistics

See your Reviewer Statistics: Enkwell (Editorial Manager) has a feature that allows you to see these stats.

From your "Reviewer Main Menu," click "My Review History" on the left-hand side.

The numbers presented are indeed meaningful, but the following categories coupled with my comments will help you quickly assess your reviewer performance:

- Historical Reviewer Invitation Statistics:
  - Agreed to Review/Declined to Review - A "great" reviewer doesn't need to have zero "Declined to Review." When you decline, it notifies the Editor-in-Chief to invite someone else.

- Historical Reviewer Performance Summary:
  - Submitted on time/Submitted late
    - 2014 Average percentage on time for PRS Section Editors: 82.76%
    - 2014 Average percentage on time for PRS Associate Editors: 85.39%
  - Un-assigned after agreeing to review - This statistic may be complicated by the Editor-in-Chief uninviting you before 14 days are up if he has enough reviews to move forward. That said, he look for reviewers to keep this number to a minimum.

- Historical Reviewer Averages:
  - Days to Complete Review – 2014 Average for PRS Editorial Board: 8.4 days
  - Days Late - Average for PRS Editorial Board: -5.3 (meaning 5 days early)
Please note that these numbers only provide us with quantitative analysis of your performance. The Editor-in-Chief and leadership always consider the quality of your reviews as well.

Reviews sent outside the system - such as when you submit your review to my editorial staff via email - are not counted toward these numbers as completed reviews; but are noted elsewhere.