Editorial

An Editor’s Thanks for Reviewer Excellence

The concept of peer review of manuscripts goes back to the founding of the first technical journal, the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, in London in 1665. That journal published papers shared at meetings and served as a permanent record of those contributions to knowledge. Peer review in those days was essentially the acceptance of a person’s credentials for election to the Society. Since then, and especially during the past 75 years, peer review has evolved into the process of double-anonymous vetting of manuscripts by expert reviewers that we take for granted today for the vast majority of technical and professional journals.

In our own time, our own discipline, and our own journal, we rely on rigorous peer review to ensure that only the highest quality content in the field of professional communication appears in these pages. That process of peer review relies on the knowledge and the good graces of reviewers who undertake this important and time-consuming task with only the thanks of the editor and the **Transactions’** readers as payment.

During 2020, 93 individuals—including associate editors, members of the editorial board, and other volunteers—have agreed to evaluate manuscripts submitted to the IEEE **Transactions on Professional Communication**. I want to acknowledge their vital service here.

### Associate Editors

Rebekka Andersen  
Craig Baehr  
Pam Estes Brewer  
Angela Eaton  
Alan Houser  
Joyce Karreman  
Aimee Kendall Roundtree  
Josephine Walwema  
Sean Williams

### Editorial Board Members

Ann Blakeslee  
Jill Burstein  
Grace Leinbach Coggio  
Yvonne Cleary  
Menno de Jong  
Claas Digmayer  
Stan Doherty  
Ann Hill Duin  
Norbert Elliot  
Carlos Evia  
Jordan Frith  
JoAnn Hackos  
Mark Hannah  
Jonathan Harrison  
Jeffrey Huset  
Melinda Kreth  
Susan Lang  
Ben Lauren  
Jon Leydens  
Joe Moses  
Kathryn Northcut  
Laura Palmer  
Varadarajan Ramanathan  
Deborah Ray  
Darina Slattery  
Jan Spyridakis  
Jason Swarts  
Deborah Sysart-Gale  
Daphne Walmer  
Robert Watson

### Other Volunteers

Matthew Apple  
J. D. Applen  
Rahel Bailie  
Abigail Bakke  
Stacy Belinsky  
Ryan Boettger  
Marina Bondi  
Hyejung Chang  
Geoff Clegg  
Annika Conrad  
Robert Davison  
Kira Dreher  
Robert Fuller  
Kevin Garrison
As I noted, peer reviewers perform this duty without pay to advance the profession and enlarge the body of knowledge that both practitioners and academics rely on in their own work. Every time that I receive a manuscript that falls within the journal’s scope, I contact two potential reviewers. One reviewer is an academic, and the other one is a practitioner or a second academic with extensive industry experience. Both have expertise on the manuscript’s topic. I request that each of them conduct an independent review of the manuscript in question within three to four weeks. When the reviewers agree to undertake the task, I send each of them an anonymized copy of the manuscript to maintain the double-blind nature of the review. The reviewers do not know the identity of the author(s), and the author(s) do not know the identity of the reviewers. Incidentally, the reviewers do not know one another’s identity either.

Reviewers complete an elaborate rubric that asks them to note strengths and weaknesses of all parts of the manuscript, and to make a summary recommendation to me as Editor-in-Chief: accept, accept with minor revisions, request the author to revise and resubmit, or reject. About 90% of the time, the reviewers’ recommendation is “revise and resubmit.” This recommendation and my comments, along with anonymized copies of the rubrics, are sent to the authors, who decide whether to submit a revised manuscript. At that point, the peer-review process is repeated with the same review team. Often, authors submit three and occasionally even four drafts of a manuscript before it is accepted for publication.

I think that this recursive peer-review process is responsible for the very high quality of the articles that we publish, and authors regularly recognize the feedback that they have received from reviewers in the Acknowledgments sections of their articles. In my mind, this process is responsible for the high level of editorial excellence that characterizes our TRANSACTIONS. I salute the invaluable contributions made by our peer reviewers. Our TRANSACTIONS and our profession are enriched by their contribution.
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