

## 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.