
Peer Review Information and Acknowledgments

Over the years a variety of questions have been received about the review process that is used for the papers submitted to the ACC-RAC conference. This year I have been asked to provide the *Journal of Chiropractic Education* with additional information about the process.

Since the early development of the Association of Chiropractic Colleges' peer review process for the annual Educational Conference, the ACC Peer Review Committee has provided the same unbiased double-blinded peer review process for submissions to this conference. This means that papers do not receive preferential treatment, nor are papers singled out for rejection, such as based on author name or affiliation. All submissions are reviewed in the same unbiased manner through the process of blinded peer review. It is important that submitters and attendees alike understand that the "contributed" presentations at this conference are not invited. The contributed presentations go through a peer review process in order to be selected for presentation.

For those who have participated in the peer review process for this conference, either as a reviewer or as an author, you may note that the process we use is very similar to what occurs at other professional, scientific, and educational conferences. This process is also similar to the process used by peer reviewed journals.

In general, the peer review process for the contributed sessions is as follows. Authors receive the call for papers for the conference as published in the *JCE*, through the web site, various forms of e-mail, or the chiropractic colleges. The primary author follows the instructions to prepare the submission and sends the completed package to the Peer

Review Chair. Prior to processing for review, the submission is screened for completeness and compliance with the submissions requirements as stated in the call for papers. Those papers that pass through the initial screening are blinded and given a submission number so that the submission can be identified, but not by author or institution.

The paper is then reviewed for content. Although the authors are required to include the submission's major topic areas in their submission form, the submission is also reviewed for additional topic areas that the authors may not have included. The submission is then matched to a minimum of 5 different reviewers from the ACC Peer Review committee based upon topic areas, range of experience and affiliation. Each reviewer submits his or her areas of expertise and provides information on the amount of publication and peer review experience. Over the years many reviewers have established an outstanding track record with the review committee, and each year new peer reviewers, both experienced and novice, are accepted to volunteer for the committee.

Some reviewers are asked to review manuscripts that cover only a portion of their content area, since not all reviewers can be experts in all topic areas. For example, one reviewer may be an expert on randomized controlled trials, another a specialist in geriatrics, and another an expert on spinal adjusting technique, but each may be assigned to review a controlled trial on spinal manipulation of a geriatric population.

When a submission is assigned to reviewers, not only is it matched to topic and expertise, it is also matched with reviewers who are not associated with

the institution of the submission authors to help with reducing bias. The complement of reviewers must also come from a variety of other institutions (e.g., all reviewers assigned to one manuscript should not come from the same location). All peer reviewers are blinded to one another, as well as the authors and the authors' institution, although some institutions are identified in subtle ways, as by geographic region.

The peer reviewers evaluate the submissions and then submit their ratings and comments back to the Peer Review Chair. We will accept no less than 3 reviewers per submission. If there are less than 3 reviewers who return their forms, we then request other reviewers to evaluate the submission until we have a minimum of 3 completed reviews.

Reviews are tallied for rating numbers and the comments are compiled. Any problems with ethical or scientific issues that were not originally identified on initial screening are brought up to the Peer Review Board for further discussion and decision. Rating numbers are only one component to determine if a submission is accepted for presentation. Comments from reviewers provide additional basis from which to determine if a submission should be presented or not. Reviewer comments are also reviewed for appropriateness. Some comments may be followed by comments from the Peer Review Chair, which may add insight or correction, and are noted in parentheses and italic font. Any paper that does not comply with basic ethical or scientific standards, regardless of high rating scores, is not accepted for presentation.

The reviewers' ratings and comments provide wonderful feedback to the authors and suggest ways that particular submissions need to be strengthened. Authors whose submissions are accepted can use these comments to improve their work prior to presentation and publication. Authors whose submissions were not accepted are encouraged to make corrections, if these are possible, and then resubmit for the following year. Once all authors have been notified, reviewers are emailed all ratings and comments for the papers they reviewed. This provides insight for reviewers into the other reviewer critiques of the submissions and improves the peer review process overall.

Some conference attendees ask why platform sessions sometimes have a mixture of paper topics that seem unrelated. There is a wide variety of topics that are submitted to the conference and therefore the range of topics of accepted papers is also broad. The Peer Review Committee focuses on quality

of presentations and not quotas, and as a result sometimes a paper is accepted for presentation but stands alone in its topic area. This poses a challenge for placement in the program. However, the Peer Review Committee is dedicated to the presentation of the work and is interested with the presentation of the paper rather than neatly fitting it into a topic area. This is why there are a wide variety of topics and the number of platform and poster presentations may vary slightly from year to year. The platform schedule for contributed papers also has a definite time limit and we must therefore limit platform presentations to the schedule that is available.

The goals for this committee are formidable and we periodically review how close we are to reaching them. The long range goals of the ACC Peer Review Committee are:

1. Maintain the scholarship of the presentations and integrity of the conference;
2. Increase quality of conference presentations;
3. Increase number of published papers as a result of the conference;
4. Increase number of experienced peer reviewers;
5. Provide scholarship opportunities for new peer reviewers; and
6. Provide mentorship and feedback to peer reviewers and authors

If you are interested in becoming a peer reviewer for this conference, please fill out and submit your application. It would be wonderful to have you on the team.

Claire Johnson, M.S.E.d., D.C.
ACC-RAC Peer Review Chair

The ACC 2005 Peer Review Committee succeeded in doing an excellent job. They are commended for their contribution to the continued improvement of this conference. The ACC would like to thank the following people who provided peer review for the 2005 conference:

Robert Appleyard, Barklay Bakkum, Deborah Barr, Julia D. Bartlett, Mary E. Berg, Jeffrey K. Bergin, Lisa K. Bloom, Charles Blum, Linda J Bowers, Myron D. Brown, Jerrilyn Cambron, Jeffrey Cates, Cindy Chapman, Michael T. Clusserath, Richard L. Cole, Matthew C. Coté, Casey Crisp, Brian M. Cunningham, Kevin Cunningham, Dwain M. Daniel, Anthony V. D'Antoni, James DeVocht, Jeffrey W. DeVore, J. Donald Dishman, Scott F. Donaldson, Stephen M. Duray, Ronald J. Feise, Charles Fernandez, Ralph Gay, Brian Glerzon,

Christopher Good, Emile Goubran, Donald Gran, Bart Green, Gary Greenstein, Charlotte Gregersen, Jaroslaw P. Grod, Tim Guest, Jan Hartvigsen, Stephen L. Haslund, Chuck Henderson, Laurie Hogard, Lisa Hoffman, Kathryn T. Hoiriis, Susan M. Holm, Dennis M.J. Homack, Joseph Horrigan, Kim Humphreys, Lynne C. Hvidsten, Leila L. Iler, Miriam Kahan, Rod Kaufman, Joanna Kee, Norman W Kettner, Partap S. Khalsa, Ron Kirk, Steven L. Kleinfield, Lisa Killinger, Stuart Kinsinger, Deborah Kopansky-Giles, Dana Lawrence, Doug Lawson, Tracey A. Littrell, Cynthia Lund, Katherine Manley-Buser, Dennis Marchiori, Cameron McDermaid, Christopher Meseke-Wren, Adrienne Miller, Warren L. Moe, Chad Moreau, Paul Mullin, Jean Murray, Kenneth E. Niemann III, Dennis Nosco, Paul Oakley, Sujatha Pamula, Lester Partna, Kevin

Paustian, Robert Percuoco, Stephen M. Perle, Dennis Peterson, Cynthia Peterson, Joseph E. Pfeifer, Bruce Pflieger, Julie A. Plezbert, Thomas M. Redenbaugh, Anthony Rosner, Richard Ruegg, Steven Rylander, Tim Schoof, Judy M. Silvestrone, Clayton Skaggs, Dean Smith, Monica Smith, Gregory J. Snow, John Stites, Larry L. Swank, Oryst O. Swyszcz, Greg Taylor, Rodger Tepe, Marcia M. Thomas, Al Traina, Meghan Van Loon, Sivarama P. Vinjamury, Robert A. Walker, Laura Weeks, Michelle A Wessely, Jonathan C Williams, Lawrence H. Wyatt, Kenneth Young, John Zhang. Editor-in-Chief *JCE*: Reed Phillips, Journal Editor *JCE*: Robert Ward. Peer Review Board: Lance Blackshaw, John Mrozek, David Wickes. Peer Review Chair: Claire Johnson. ACC Executive Director: David O'Bryon.