

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. Appen
 Rahel Bailie
 Abigail Bakke
 Stacy Belinsky
 Ryan Boettger
 Marina Bondi
 Hyejung Chang
 Geoff Clegg
 Annika Conrad
 Robert Davison
 Kira Dreher
 Robert Fuller
 Kevin Garrison

IEEE 10.1109/TPC.2021.3058055

Guiseppe Getto
 Barbara Giammona
 Jennifer Goode
 Helen Grady
 Brad Henderson
 Marjorie Rush Hovde
 Liz Hutter
 Suguru Ishizaki
 Guangsa Jin
 Tom Johnson
 Lilian Khaw
 Miles Kimball
 Charles Kostelnick
 Chris Lam
 Brian Larson
 Claire Lauer
 Chris Lindgren
 Bruce Maylath
 Lisa Melançon
 Cathryn Mollo
 Kristen Moore
 Cindy Nahrwold
 Elizabeth Patterson
 Laura Patterson
 Rebecca Pope-Ruark
 Tammy Rice-Bailey
 Derek Ross
 Jeremy Rosselot-Merritt
 Archana Shrivastava
 Sarah Singer
 Meredith Singleton
 Clay Spinuzzi
 Kirk St. Amant
 Rhonda Stanton
 Yoel Strempling
 Jason Tham
 Sharon Turner
 Dan Voss
 Ann Wiley
 Laura Zdanski

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.

GEORGE F. HAYHOE, *Editor-in-Chief*
 Department of Technical Communication
 Mercer University School of Engineering
 Fletcher, NC 28732 USA
 (email: Hayhoe_G@mercer.edu)

George F. Hayhoe (Life Fellow, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in English from the University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA, in 1979. He is currently a Professor Emeritus with the Department of Technical Communication, Mercer University School of Engineering, Fletcher, NC, USA.