

**The EASE
Peer Review
Card Exchange
Game**

stimulating debate of
peer review practice,
policy and ethics

ease / European Association
of Science Editors

TRIBE **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY
OF THE
ROYAL COLLEGE OF
PHYSICIANS

ease publications

1

Short instructions

- ✓ 6-8 cards per group
- ✓ Select a minimum of 3 cards that all the members of the group agree with and justify why are you keeping these cards
- ✓ Select at least one card that all the members of the group do not agree on
- ✓ You can exchange cards with other groups before your final decision

Credits
Current version: 2024
First version: 2018

This card game was developed for EASE by Buzica Tokalic and Ana Marusic, published in an original article in *European Science Editing*.
Tokalic B, Marusic A (2018) A peer review card exchange game.
European Science Editing 4(4):32-55.
doi.org/10.20319/ESSE.2018.44.18007

More about EASE: <https://ease.org.uk/>

The European Association of Science Editors is an international community of editors with a mission to improve global standards and quality in science editing and research publishing.

2

Card 1

A review should be done within a designated time, otherwise authors could be hurt professionally

Responsiveness

TRIBE **ease** / **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

3

Card 2

If a reviewer is too busy and knows that they will not manage to review within a designated time, they should decline to be a reviewer

Responsiveness

TRIBE **ease** / **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

4

Card 3

Time needed for a careful and thorough review should be decided on by the reviewer, and not the editor or authors

Responsiveness

TRIBE **ease** / **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

5

Card 4

It is more important that an appropriate reviewer assesses the research than to review the manuscript on time

Responsiveness

TRIBE **ease** / **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

6

Card 5

If a reviewer is too busy and knows they will not manage to review in designated time, it is acceptable to ask help from a collaborator

Responsiveness

TRIBE **ease** / **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

7

Card 6

Reviewer should clearly declare their scientific competence to journal editor or a funding body before the review process

Competence

TRIBE **ease** / **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

8

Card 7

If a reviewer is unfamiliar with some methods or statistical analysis, they should ask a colleague or a statistician for help. It is not necessary to report this to the editor

Competence


TRIBE **ease** / **M** MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

9

Card 8

If a reviewer is unfamiliar with some methods or statistical analysis, they should avoid commenting on it and focus on areas of their own competence. This should be reported to the editor

Competence




10

Card 9

Peer reviewers should only be researchers selected from the same research field as the submitted manuscript

Competence




11

Card 10

Research results should be assessed by experts from different fields, to make the assessment more valid

Competence




12

Card 11

One should not review papers from authors with whom they have previous research collaboration

Impartiality




13

Card 12

Reviews should be double-anonymised, to avoid as many biases as possible

Impartiality




14

Card 13

Reviews should be completely transparent and accessible. Reviewers may choose to disclose their identity, and reviews should be available to read alongside the publication

Impartiality



15

Card 14

Apparent conflicts of interest do not have to be reported, as long as the review is performed ethically and responsibly

Impartiality




16

Card 15

Not all conflicts of interest should prevent a reviewer from assessing a paper

Impartiality




17

Card 16

A reviewer should never suggest citing their own work

Impartiality



18

Card 17

Changing your own experiments and course of research because of new information you obtained from a manuscript you have reviewed is acceptable practice

Confidentiality



19

Card 18

Using review process to get new ideas and collaborations for research is perfectly acceptable

Confidentiality



20

Card 19

Reviewers should not contact the authors even after the publication of the paper

Confidentiality



21

Card 20

Editor should never allow contact between the reviewer and the author during the review process

Confidentiality



22

Card 21

It is acceptable to show the manuscript you are reviewing to your colleague if you need advice on some issues in the manuscript

Confidentiality



23

Card 22

It is sufficient that a reviewer recognizes and points to a problem in a manuscript under review

Constructive Criticism



24

Card 23

The reviewer should identify a problem in the manuscript but also suggest solutions or alternative approaches

Constructive Criticism



25

Card 24

The reviewer should assess if a paper is suitable for the scope and standards of the journal, and not only its scientific validity

Constructive Criticism



26

Card 25

The reviewer should check that all citations in the manuscript are accurate, relevant to the study and matched with a reference

Constructive Criticism




27

Card 26

The reviewer should always edit the language of the manuscript

Constructive Criticism




28

Card 27

Participation in peer review is a valuable service to science in general

Responsibility to Science




29

Card 28

Peer review improves the quality of research

Responsibility to Science




30

Card 29

Peer reviewers should be given more credit, including some sort of financial payment

Responsibility to Science




31

Card 30

Peer review is a quid pro quo service, and reviewers should not be financially compensated

Responsibility to Science




32

Card 31

Peer review hinders progress by dismissing innovative research as controversial and not publication-worthy

Responsibility to Science




33

Card 32

Peer review does not help improve our body of knowledge because it does not prevent papers from being published

Responsibility to Science




34

Card 33

AI tools should be used as additional reviewers for research manuscripts as they can provide well substantiated reviews

Artificial Intelligence




35

Card 34

AI should not be used for assessing manuscripts without guarantees that author information and ideas are not released in the public domain or used for product generation

Artificial Intelligence



36

Card 35

Reviewers should not use AI tools in peer review until it is demonstrated that they can improve the quality of methodology, analyses, reporting, or interpretations

Artificial Intelligence



37

Card 36

AI text and data generation may lead to more fabricated studies, and an inability to properly peer review such studies

Artificial Intelligence



38

Card 37

AI tools should be used to help improve quality of writing of non-native authors and reviewers, and to help find a more diverse reviewer pool

Artificial Intelligence



39

Card 38

Use of AI for drafting or editing of review reports should be declared by peer reviewers

Artificial Intelligence



40