
Peer Review Information and Acknowledgments for ACC-RAC 2010

This is the 17th year of the contributed, peer-reviewed presentation section of the Association of Chiropractic Colleges Educational Conference–Research Agenda Conference (ACC-RAC). The following is a brief review of the peer review process for the scientific, contributed sessions for the ACC-RAC 2010 conference. The scientific presentations go through a peer-reviewed selection process; thus they are not invited presentations such as the workshop or plenary sessions. The ACC Peer Review Committee’s mission is to provide an unbiased, double-blinded, peer review process for submissions to this conference.

This year was an especially challenging year in that we received a much larger number of submissions than we have in past years. In spite of the extra submissions and the resulting increased workload, we were still able to complete our tasks and submit decisions to authors and materials for continuing education by the declared deadlines.

Our submission and peer review process was completed online, which helped to facilitate the processing of comments and rating of submissions. Authors followed the instructions in the Call for Submissions to prepare and submit their works through the ACC-RAC peer review website. Each submission was matched to a minimum of five different ACC Peer Review Committee members from a different institution and the match was based on topic, range of experience, and affiliation. Some reviewers were asked to review manuscripts that covered only a portion of their content area, since not all reviewers are experts in all topic areas. For example, one reviewer may be an expert on systematic reviews, another a specialist in spinal injuries,

and another an expert on spinal adjusting technique, but each may have been assigned to review a systematic review of adjusting patients with spinal injuries. All submissions were reviewed in the same unbiased manner through the process of blinded peer review. Submissions were evaluated on their quality and did not receive preferential treatment nor were they singled out for rejection based on reasons such as author name, degrees, or affiliation.

The peer reviewers evaluated the submissions using a structured form and submitted their ratings and comments to the website. Any potential problems with ethical or scientific issues that were not originally identified on initial screening were brought before the Peer Review Board for further investigation, discussion, and decision. Any paper that did not comply with basic ethical or scientific standards, regardless of high rating scores, was not accepted for presentation. Both rating numbers and comments from reviewers were used to determine if a submission should or should not be presented as either a poster or platform presentation. The reviewers’ ratings and comments gave authors constructive feedback so that they could use these comments to improve their work prior to presentation and to assist them with developing their paper for publication.

Any process that involves humans, such as peer review, is not perfect. Reviewers sometimes contradict one another and authors or reviewers may disagree with some of the decisions made by the review committee. Also, some submissions may only receive a “fair” rating initially; however, by the time of the conference, the author has incorporated the constructive feedback from the peer reviewers and

the presentation is far better than the one originally submitted. This would make it appear to an attendee as if the review process was flawed, whereas in reality the process was a success due to the improvements made by the author in time for the presentation at the conference. It is important to note that not all flaws in submissions can be identified. Peer review is not meant to act as a policing or fraud detection agency and we must respect its limitations. As well, not all exceptional items were praised due to the space and time limitations of the reviewers. However, the overall peer review process, using a combination of blinded reviewers, has produced an excellent conference over the past 17 years. Peer review has its limitations but still serves an important purpose of ensuring quality of presentations at this scientific conference.

Some conference attendees may notice that some platform sessions have a mixture of paper topics or sometimes papers in one set of presentations seem to be unrelated. This is because of the wide variety of topics that are submitted to the conference; therefore, the range of topics of accepted papers is also varied. Because the ACC Peer Review Committee focuses on quality and not quotas, sometimes a paper is accepted for presentation but may stand alone as a topic and must be placed somewhere in the program. The Peer Review Committee is interested in the presentation of a quality paper rather than whether it fits neatly into a particular topic area. The platform schedule for contributed papers is limited; therefore, we are only allowed to select a finite number of platform presentations.

The long-range goals of the ACC Peer Review Committee include the following: 1) to maintain the scholarship of the presentations and integrity of the conference, 2) to improve the quality of conference presentations, 3) to increase the number of published papers as a result of the conference, 4) to increase the number of experienced peer reviewers, 5) to provide scholarship opportunities for new peer reviewers, and 6) to provide mentorship and feedback to peer reviewers and authors. Each year we strive to continue to improve our processes.

The ACC 2010 Peer Review Committee succeeded in doing an excellent job. The committee is commended for their contribution to the continued improvement of scholarship of this conference. We would like to thank the following people who provided peer review for the 2010 conference:

Steve Agocs, Medat Alatar, Kris Anderson, Maria Anderson, Robert Appleyard, Barclay Bakkum,

Angela Ballew, Ryunosuke Banzai, Deborah Barr, Jason Bartlett, Julia Bartlett, Randy Beck, Lisa Bloom, Charles Blum, Ron Boesch, Cara Borggren, Linda Bowers, Rick Branson, James Brantingham, Joseph Brimhall, Myron Brown, Kara Burnham, Alana Callender, Jerrilyn Cambron, Marni Capes, Jonathan Carlos, Jeffrey Cates, Annick Champagne, Cynthia Chapman, Michael Ciolfi, Richard Cole, Christopher Colloca, Katharine Conable, Elaine Cooperstein, Robert Cooperstein, Matthew Cote, Brian Cunningham, Kevin Cunningham, Dwain Daniel, Vincent DeBono, Mark Dehen, Dustin Derby, Martin Descarreaux, James DeVocht, Renee DeVries, J. Donald Dishman, Scott Donaldson, Karol Donaubauer, Paul Dougherty, Andrew Dunn, Stephen Duray, Jonathon Egan, Roger Engel, Dennis Enix, Will Evans, Joe Ferguson, Margaret Finn, Jason Flanagan, Matthew Funk, Weiqing Ge, Gene Giggelman, David Gilkey, Brian Gleberzon, Christine Goertz, Christoher Good, Emile Goubran, Stephen Grand, Julie-Marthe Grenier, Thomas Grieve, Tim Gross, Niels Grunnet-Nilsson, Joseph Guagliardo, Ram Gudavalli, Tim Guest, Andrea Haan, Michael Hall, Michael Haneline, Laura Hanson, Daniel Haun, Shawn He, Jeff Hebert, Kathryn Hoiriis, Kelly Holt, Dennis Homack, Todd Hubbard, Laura Huber, Mozammil Hussain, John Hyland, Leila Iler, Steven Jaffe, Dale Johnson, Valerie Johnson, Robert Jusino, Mohsen Kazemi, Kimberly Keene, Norman Kettner, Ron Kirk, Anupama Kizhakkeveetil, Steven Kleinfeld, Terry Koo, Deborah Kopansky-Giles, Charmaine Korporaal, Curt Krause, Danik Lafond, Dana Lawrence, Kathleen Linaker, Anthony Lisi, Tracey Littrell, Cynthia Lund, Owen Lynch, Michele Maiers, Christopher Major, Katherine Manley-Buser, Barbara Mansholt, Matthew McCoy, Melissa McMullen, Marc McRae, Christopher Meseke, Jamie Meseke, Mitchell Miglis, Silvano Mior, Betsy Mitchell, Veronica Mittak, Kenice Morehouse, John Mosby, Linda Mullin, Donald Murphy, Rita Nafziger, Jason Napuli, Harrison Ndetan, Martin C. Normand, David Odiorne, Per J. Palmgren, Ian Paskowski, Steven Passmore, Kevin Paustian, Georgina Pearson, Stephen Perle, Bucky Perruoco, Dennis Peterson, Kristina Petrocco-Napuli, Mark Pfefer, Jean-Philippe Pialesse, Julie Plezbert, Katherine Pohlman, Jean-Nicolas Poirier, Mohsen Radpasand, Robert Rectenwald, Thomas Redenbaugh, Diane Resnick, Paula Robinsnon, Patricia Rogers, Kevin Rose, Anthony Rosner, Robert Rowell, Drew Rubin, Lisa Rubin, Rick

Ruegg, Ronald Rupert, Eric Russell, Michael Sackett, Sandy Sajko, Michael Schneider, Tom Schulte, Gary Schultz, Charles Sherrod, David Sikorski, Judy Silvestrone, Jodell Skaufel, Monica Smith, Gregory Snow, Brian Snyder, Xue-Jun Song, Gerald Stevens, John Stites, Kent Stuber, Stephanie Sullivan, Randy Swenson, Oryst Swyszcz, Dorrie Talmage, Greg Taylor, Heidi Haavik Taylor, Anne Taylor-Vaisey, Rodger Tepe, Marcia Thomas, H. Garrett Thompson, Gene Tobias, Michael Tomasello, Michael Tunning, William Updyke, Meghan Van Loon, Darcy Vavrek, Robert Walker, Robert Ward, Keith Wells, Michelle Wessely, Kristine Westrom, David Wickes, Michael Wiles, Jonathan Williams, Lawrence Wyatt, Kenneth Young, Morgan Young,

Jenny Yu, Michael Zumpano. Editor of *The Journal of Chiropractic Education*: Bart Green. Peer Review Board: John Mrozek, Bart Green, David O'Bryon. Peer Review Chair: Claire Johnson. ACC Executive Director: David O'Bryon.

These committee members have done a wonderful job and should be appropriately recognized for their service of scholarly peer review. If you are interested in becoming a peer reviewer for this conference, please consider joining us for the 2011 conference. It would be wonderful to have you join us.

Claire Johnson, DC, MSED
ACC-RAC Peer Review Chair
johnsondc@aol.com