medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Online training in manuscript peer review: a systematic review

Jessie V. Willis[1,2] (0000-0001-8909-5891)

Kelly D. Cobey[3,4] (0000-0003-2797-1686)

Janina Ramos[1,5] (0000-0002-7284-4734)

Ryan Chow[1,2] (0000-0002-1850-7155)

Jeremy Y. Ng[1] (0000-0003-0031-5873)

Mohsen Alayche[1,2] (0000-0002-5653-746X)

David Moher[1,4] (0000-0003-2434-4206)

[1]Centre for Journalology, Clinical Epidemiology Program, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada, [2]Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Canada, [3]University of Ottawa Heart Institute, Ottawa, Canada, [4]School of Epidemiology, Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada, [5]Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, University of Ottawa, Canada

*Corresponding author: Jessie V. Willis (jessievwillis@gmail.com)

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Funding

This study is unfunded.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: DM, JVW, KDC

Project administration: JVW

Search strategy: JVW, JYN

Data curation: JVW, JR, RC

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Supervision: DM, KDC

Writing - original draft: JVW

Writing - review and editing: All authors

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Lindsey Sikora (Research Librarian, Health Sciences Library at the University of Ottawa) for assistance with the development of the search strategy and Risa Shorr (Librarian, The Ottawa Hospital) for completion of the PRESS form.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background

Peer review is an integral part of maintaining the current standard of scientific publishing. Despite this, there is no training standard for peer reviewers and review guidelines tend to vary between journals. The purpose of this study was to conduct a systematic review of all openly available online training in scholarly peer review and to analyze their characteristics.

Methods

MEDLINE, PsycINFO, Embase, ERIC, and Web of Science were systematically searched. Additional grey literature searches were conducted on Google, YouTube, university library websites, publisher websites and the websites of peer review related events and groups. All English or French training material in scholarly manuscript peer review of biomedical manuscripts openly accessible online on the search date (September 12, 2021) were included. Sources created prior to 2012 were excluded. Screening was conducted in duplicate in two separate phases: title and abstract followed by full text. Data extraction was conducted by one reviewer and verified by a second. Conflicts were resolved by third-party at both stages. Characteristics were reported using frequencies and percentages. A direct content analysis was preformed using pre-defined topics of interest based on existing checklists for peer reviewers. A risk of bias tool was purpose-built for this study to evaluate the included training material as evidence-based. The tool was used in duplicate with conflicts resolved through discussion between the two reviewers.

Results

After screening 1244 records, there were 45 sources that met the inclusion criteria; however, 23 of 45 (51%) were not able to be fully accessed for data extraction. The most common barriers to access were membership requirements (n = 11 of 23, 48%), availability for a limited time (n = 8, 35%), and paywalls with an average cost of $99 USD (n = 7, 30%). The remaining 22 sources were included in the data analysis. All sources were published in English. Most sources either did not report publication date (n =

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

10, 45%) or were created in the last five years (n = 10, 45%). The most common training format was an online module (n = 12, 57%) with an estimated completion time of less than one hour (n = 15, 68%). The most frequently covered topics included how to write a peer review report (n = 20, 91%), critical appraisal of data and results (n = 18, 82%), and a definition of peer review (n = 18, 82%). Critical appraisal of reporting guidelines (n = 9, 41%), clinical trials (n = 4, 18%), and statistical analysis (n = 4, 18%) were less commonly covered. Using our ad-hoc risk of bias tool, four sources (18%) met our criteria for evidence-based.

Conclusion

Our comprehensive search of the literature identified 22 openly accessible online training materials in manuscript peer review. For such a crucial step in the dissemination of literature, a lack of training could potentially explain disparities in the quality of scholarly publishing. Future efforts should be focused on creating a more unified openly accessible online manuscript peer review training program.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Peer review is often considered to be of vital importance to the credibility of scholarly publishing[1-3]. It encompasses the standard practice in which handpicked experts, or "peers", critically appraise a submitted manuscript for any concerns that would make it unsuitable for publication[4]. Peer reviewers are expected to provide constructive feedback to the authors and, if asked, a recommendation to the journal editor on whether to reject or accept the paper[5].

Despite being the accepted gold standard, peer review is not free from criticism and skepticism[6,7] with inquiries into improving and innovating peer review at the forefront of discussion[8,9]. Previous studies have shown peer review to lack transparency, reproducibility, and consistency[10-14]. Since peer review is typically conducted internally by each journal, there is no standard training, objective guidelines, or formal evaluation done for reviewers[15,16]. A recent study demonstrated that journal-provided reviewer guidelines varied greatly between journals[17].

The current state of peer review requires a feasible intervention that can improve quality standards and provide uniformity[18]. Specifically, an established training standard for peer reviewers could address many of the current limitations[19]. A standard training process could provide assurance that all peer reviewers are knowledgeable on topics core to functioning as a reviewer, including but not limited to selective reporting bias and "spin"[20,21]. Unfortunately, data currently available on training interventions is small-scale and shows insignificant benefit[22-25]. Additionally, these studies were published before the popularization of online training, which would be a much more convenient format for journals or institutions to implement. Additionally, recent surveys have shown training to be highly desired, especially by early career researchers (ECRs)[26,27]. A 2018 online survey conducted by Publons found that 88% of respondents believe training is important for ensuring credibility of peer review[28].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Given the above, we performed a systematic review of all openly available online training material for peer review of biomedical manuscripts. An analysis of the characteristics of the existing corpus of training material could potentially assist in the development of future standardized training programs.

METHODS

This article was written in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews[29]. The study protocol was registered on Open Science Framework prior to data collection (https://osf.io/x5yc9) and was used as a direct reference for the creation of this manuscript[30].

Data sources and searches

The search strategy was developed in collaboration between two members of the review team (JVW, JYN) and a medical research librarian (LS). Another medical librarian (RS) peer reviewed the search strategy using the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) Checklist[31]. Our search of databases was not restricted by language, as we wished to record the existence of training in other languages. The following databases were searched through the OVID platform: MEDLINE, PsycINFO, Embase and ERIC on September 12, 2021. In addition, Web of Science was searched on September 13, 2021. The OVID search strategy is reported in Appendix 1. A forward and backward citation analysis was conducted of sources included at the data extraction stage. Preprint servers (OSF and MedRxiv) and PROSPERO were also searched to identify similar systematic reviews. Grey literature searches were conducted of Google, YouTube, university library websites, publisher websites, and websites of peer review related groups/events. The full grey literature search strategy can be found in Appendix 2.

Eligibility criteria

Included sources were online educational material intended for biomedical manuscript peer reviewers available and openly accessible on the search date, published in either English or French, and created after January 1, 2012. The rationale for the cut-off year was based on the year the Publons website

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

(https://publons.com/, Clarivate Analytics) was launched. The launch of Publons marked a significant innovation in peer review and a call for higher quality reviewing[32]. Additionally, Publons had developed the earliest freely accessible online training material for peer review recognized by the authors. For this reason, it was thought that any high-quality and relevant training in the current state of peer review would have been created after 2012. Exclusion criteria included sources describing other types of peer review beyond that at academic journals (e.g., grant review, review for tenure and promotion) or publications on peer review that are opinion-based (e.g., commentary, opinion articles). We recorded the existence of sources that were inaccessible (e.g., paywall, membership) or in a language other than English or French, but these were excluded from data analysis.

Screening process

Search results were imported into DistillerSR (Evidence Partners Inc., Ottawa, Canada), which was used as the software for removing duplicates, screening, and data extraction. Screening was done in an expedited process whereby all articles were screened by one reviewer and only excluded articles were verified by a separate independent reviewer. The screening was conducted in two stages: title and abstract followed by full text. Conflicts were resolved by consensus or through a third-party screener at both stages. Screening questions can be found in Appendix 3.

Data extraction and internal validity assessment

Data extraction was performed in DistillerSR. The data extraction form was pilot tested by each of the two reviewers with 10 records each. Data extraction was completed in duplicate by two reviewers independently. Conflicts were resolved by consensus discussion between the two reviewers or by a third-party. The data extraction items can be found in Appendix 4.

In traditional systematic reviews (i.e., assessing the effects on an intervention) risk of bias assessment is considered a best practice. There is no risk of bias tools for methodological reviews. We developed our own internal validity tool following previous efforts[34]. The questions were pilot tested by our data

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

extractors. There were six items on our tool. Briefly, these were 1) having representation of greater than one stakeholder group in the author list, 2) reporting data gathering (i.e., conducting a survey) for development of the training, 3) reporting pilot testing, 4) having clear learning objectives, 5) having a method of self-testing or evaluation, and 6) having a method of providing feedback. For each selected source, this questionnaire was completed by two independent reviewers in Excel, and conflicts were resolved by consensus (see Appendix 5 for full internal validity tool). We considered a training 'evidence-based' if four (of the six) questions were answered affirmatively.

Data synthesis and analysis

The training sources were evaluated qualitatively and compared against each other for overall content. Results were reported in table format and with frequencies and percentages listed. A directed content analysis was done with predefined codes based on existing checklists for peer reviewers, reporting guidelines and expert opinion (DM)[33].

RESULTS

Deviations from our protocol

We had initially defined "course registration" as an exclusion criterion as it could potentially be a barrier to access. Additionally, we had believed it would be infeasible to register for each training material in the data extraction phase. However, a registration requirement was common with a large portion of references blocked by registration alone. It was therefore decided to include these sources. Two independent reviewers registered for these sources to perform full data extraction.

Study selection

We identified 1058 sources with the database search and 487 sources with the grey literature search. Following duplicate removal, a total of 1244 records were screened, and 45 sources were identified as eligible. Of these eligible sources, there were 23 (51%) that had limited access and could not be included

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

in data extraction. One of these sources had an advanced version blocked by paywall but a free basic version that was added to the final analysis. The most common barriers were membership criteria (n = 11 of 23, 48%), such as being a student or staff member of a university; limited time availability (n = 8, 35%), such as being a recurring event but not currently offered; and paywalls (n = 7, 30%). The average paywall amount was $99 USD, the cheapest being $10 USD and most expensive being $185 USD (n = 5). A full PRISMA flow diagram with exclusion reasons is reported in Figure 1.

Figure 1**. PRISMA flow diagram of included studies**



*one reference was split into two separate references as there was both a free and paid version

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Training characteristics

In total, there were 22 sources that met the criteria of being fully openly available online training sources for peer review and were included in the data analysis. Full characteristics are listed in Table 1.

Author, Year	Title / Link	Country	Organization	Target audience	Funding	Format	TTC	Proof of completion	Languages
Dickersin, 2012	Free Online Course on Journal Peer Review	USA	Other	Other	Public	Online module	4-8h	No	No
Chandran, 2013	Peer Review of Manuscripts: An Online Training Module	USA	Academic	All researchers	NR	Online module	0.5-1h	No	No
Sainani, 2017	Doing a peer review	USA	Academic	All researchers	NR	Online video	10-30 min	Other	Multiple (subtitles)
Veis, 2018	Journal Peer Review: Tips for Writing an Effective Evaluation	USA	Journal	Journal reviewers	NR	Webinar	0.5-1h	No	No
Foster, 2018	Open Peer Review	Multiple	Other	No	NR	Online module	0.5-1h	Other	No
Tokalić, 2018	A peer review card exchange game	Croatia	Academic	All researchers	Private	Card game	10-30 min	No	No
Chauvin, 2019	COBPeer training module	France	Academic	ECR	None	Online module	10-30 min	Other	No
Lovick, 2020	How to Be A Peer Reviewer	USA	Publisher	No	NR	Webinar	0.5-1h	No	No
Stiller-Reeve, 2021	How to master peer review	Germany	Publisher	No	NR	Webinar	1-2 hours	No	No
Elsevier, 2021	Certified Peer Reviewer Course	Netherlands	Publisher	No	NR	Online module	4-8 hours	Yes	Chinese
Marshall, 2021	Peer Reviewer Training - How to Get Published	Multiple	Other	No	NR	Webinar	1-2 hours	No	Chinese
Taylor & Francis, 2022	Excellence in Peer Review: Expert Peer Review Training	Multiple	Publisher	All researchers	NR	Online module	1-2 hours	Yes	No
ASHA Journals	The Peer Review Excellence Program	USA	Publisher	Journal reviewers	NR	Online module	0.5-1h	No	No
The BMJ	Reviewer training materials	UK	Journal	Journal reviewers	NR	Website of resources	0.5-1h	No	No
BMJ Journals	How to peer review	UK	Publisher	Journal reviewers	NR	Website of resources	10-30 min	No	No
Nature Masterclass	Focus on Peer Review — free course	Germany	Publisher	ECR	NR	Online module	2-4 hours	Yes	No
Optica	Reviewer certification	USA	Publisher	Journal reviewers	NR	Online module	0.5-1h	Yes	No
Springer Nature	How to Peer Review	Germany	Publisher	All researchers	NR	Online module	10-30 min	No	No
University of Manchester	My Research Essentials: Peer Review	UK	Academic	All researchers	NR	Online module	10-30 min	No	No
Wiley	Journal Reviewers	USA	Publisher	Journal reviewers	NR	Website of resources	10-30 min	No	No
Web of Science	An Introduction to Peer Review	UK	Other	ECR	NR	Online module	10-30 min	Yes	No
Wolters Kluwer	Peer Reviewer Training Course	Netherlands	Publisher	All researchers	NR	Online module	2-4 hours	No	No

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1**. Characteristics of training sources (oldest to most recent)**

Abbreviation: NR, not reported; ECR, early career researchers.

Author information, publication date and funding disclosures

More than half of training sources did not have clear author information listed (n = 12, 55%). Similarly, most sources did not provide funding disclosures (n = 19, 86%). Ten sources (45%) were created in the last five years. Two (9%) were created prior to 2017. Ten sources (45%) did not report the publication date.

Countries that created the most training sources include the United States (n = 8, 36%), United Kingdom (n = 4, 18%), and Germany (n = 3, 14%). Organizations that created training were most often publishers (n = 11, 50%) and academic institutions (n = 5, 23%).

Language and translation

All online sources were primarily published in English. Three (14%) had additional language options; one which was fully delivered in both English and Chinese (Mandarin), one which provided virtual workshops in either English or Chinese (Mandarin), and one which provided video subtitles in other languages.

Training format, target audience and approximate time for user to complete training

Most training sources were online modules (n = 13, 59%). Other formats included recorded webinars (n = 4, 18%), websites of resources (n = 3, 14%), an asynchronous online video (n = 1, 5%), and a game (n = 1, 5%).

Defined target audiences included all researchers (n = 7, 32%), reviewers at the journal which created the training (n = 6, 27%), and early career researchers (n = 3, 14%). Five sources (23%) did not define the target audience.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

All training material took at least 10 minutes to complete. Most training material could be completed in less than one hour (n = 15, 68%), eight (36%) could be completed within half an hour and seven between half an hour and one hour. Three (14%) took 1-2 hours to complete, two (9%) took 2-4 hours and the two (9%) longest took 4-8 hours. Five sources (23%) were part of a larger course or curriculum that did not solely focus on peer review.

Proof of completion

Most training sources did not provide any proof of completion such as a certificate or badge (n = 14, 64%). Five sources (23%) provided certificate of completion. One source (5%) provided a certificate only after purchase of the full course. Other incentives for completion included CME credits (n = 1, 5%) and a badge (n = 1, 5% [40]).

Content analysis of the training sources included

We assessed the 22 included sources for predefined content areas. A full list is included in Table 2 and depicted graphically in Figure 2.

Figure 2. **Content analysis of covered topics expressed as percentage of all included sources**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Table 2. **Content analysis of included topics**

	Process-related				Critical appraisal of						
Author, Year	**What is peer review**	**Types of peer review**	**How to write a peer review report**	**How to become a peer reviewer**	**methods**	**data and results**	**clinical trials**	**statistics**	**reporting guidelines**	**ethical concerns**	**academic writing**
Dickersin, 2012	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Chandran, 2013	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
Sainani, 2017		X	X		X	X					
Veis, 2018	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	
Foster, 2018	X	X									
Tokalić, 2018			X								
Chauvin, 2019					X	X	X	X	X		
Lovick, 2020	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Stiller-Reeve, 2021	X		X	X							X
Elsevier, 2021	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Marshall, 2021	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X
Taylor & Francis, 2022			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
ASHA Journals	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	
The BMJ	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

BMJ Journals	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		
Nature Masterclass	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X
Optica	X		X	X	X	X				X	X
Springer Nature	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X
University of Manchester	X	X	X		X	X					X
Web of Science	X	X	X	X							
Wiley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
Wolters Kluwer	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	
Total (n, %)	18, 82	13, 59	20, 91	17, 77	17, 77	18, 82	4, 18	4, 18	9, 41	14, 64	11, 50

Definition of peer review and subtypes: 18 sources (82%) provided an introductory description of peer review and 13 sources (59%) further provided information on the subtypes of peer review (i.e., open peer review).

How to become a peer reviewer: 17 sources (77%) provided guidance on how to get involved in peer review.

How to write a peer review report: 20 sources (91%) provided guidance on how to synthesize a proper peer review report.

Critical appraisal of methodology: 17 sources (77%) provided specific guidance on critical appraisal of the methodology.

Critical appraisal of data and results: 18 sources (82%) provided specific guidance on critical appraisal of the data and results.

Critical appraisal of clinical trials: 4 sources (18%) provided specific guidance on critical appraisal of clinical trials.

Critical appraisal of statistics: 4 sources (18%) provided specific guidance on critical appraisal of statistical analysis.

Critical appraisal of reporting guidelines: 9 sources (41%) provided specific guidance on critical appraisal of reporting guidelines (ex. CONSORT).

Critical appraisal of ethical issues: 14 sources (64%) provided specific guidance on critical appraisal of ethical considerations (ex. bias, conflicts of interest, plagiarism, or misconduct).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Critical appraisal of academic writing: 11 sources (50%) provided specific guidance on critical appraisal of academic writing.

Risk of bias assessment

Overall, four training sources (18%) were assessed as evidence based. Full risk of bias items for each reference can be found in Table 3.

Based on author affiliations, twelve training sources (55%) involved more than one stakeholder group in the creation or delivery (low risk of bias). Fifteen sources (68%) did not clearly report data gathering prior to the creation of the training material (unclear risk of bias). Twenty sources (91%) did not clearly report pilot testing of the training (unclear risk of bias). Twelve training sources (55%) had learning objectives (low risk of bias). Twelve training sources (55%) provided a method for which a user could test their learning such as an online quiz or practice peer review sample (low risk of bias). Eight sources (36%) provided a method for users to provide feedback on the training material (low risk of bias).

Table 3**. Internal validity tool of included sources**

Author, Year	Representation 1+ stakeholder group	Gather data for training development	Pilot testing	Learning objectives	Evaluation of learning	Feedback method	Overall assessment
Dickersin, 2012	Y	Only citations	U	Y	Y	Y	**Y**
Chandran, 2013	Y	Only citations	Y	Y	N	N	N
Sainani, 2017	N	U	U	N	N	N	N
Veis, 2018	N	U	U	Y	N	N	N
FOSTER, 2018	Y	Only citations	U	Y	Y	N	N
Tokalić, 2018	Y	Only citations	Y	N	N	N	N
Chauvin, 2019	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	**Y**
Lovick, 2020	Y	U	U	N	N	N	N
Stiller-Reeve, 2021	Y	U	U	Y	N	N	N
Elsevier, 2021	Y	U	U	Y	Y	Y	**Y**
Marshall, 2021	Y	U	U	N	N	N	N
Taylor & Francis, 2022	N	U	U	Y	Y	N	N
ASHA Journals	N	U	U	Y	Y	Y	N
The BMJ	N	Only citations	U	Y	N	N	N
BMJ Journals	N	U	U	N	N	N	N
Nature Masterclass	Y	U	U	Y	Y	Y	**Y**
Optica	N	Only citations	U	N	Y	Y	N
Springer Nature	N	U	U	N	Y	N	N
University of Manchester	N	U	U	N	Y	Y	N
Web of Science	Y	U	U	N	Y	Y	N
Wiley	N	U	U	Y	N	N	N

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Wolters Kluwer	Y	U	U	N	Y	Y	N

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

In our comprehensive search of the literature, we identified 45 training opportunities in manuscript peer review in the past 10 years, of which less than half were openly accessible online. Of the 22 included sources, more than half were online modules and could be completed in less than one hour. Overall, based on our assessment of internal validity, only four sources met our criteria of evidence-based.

For such a common activity, we were surprised by the small number of openly accessible online training sources in manuscript peer review. This is consistent with the findings of other previous studies[21] as well as our own recently conducted survey of biomedical researchers in which most respondents indicated they had never received peer review training. Additionally, in our survey, being unable to find accessible training was identified as a barrier to pursuing training for most respondents[57].

While the training sources that required less than an hour to complete may act as an appropriate introduction to peer review, it is not clear how much training can be acquired in such a short period of time. The three training sources that had the longest time to completion were additionally evaluated as evidence-based using our internal validity tool. Furthermore, this could explain why more complex topics, such as clinical trials, statistics and reporting guidelines were less commonly covered. In our recently conducted survey, the most desired training format was a full online course of greater than six sessions. Additionally, more complex topics, such as statistical analysis, were highly desired. We believe something more fulsome in content and time may result in higher quality peer reviewers and address existing knowledge gaps.

A lack of training in peer review may help to explain why there continues to be an abundance of low-quality research published[58]. Despite spending upwards of 100 million hours annually completing peer review[59], it is unfortunate that more research has not examined ways to codify training and professionalism in peer review[19,21]. The scholarship around peer review appears to focus on ways to extend peer reviewing, such as to preprints[60], or future innovations in peer review[1,7]. Did we get ahead of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

ourselves? How can we advance any aspect of peer review without getting the fundamentals right, namely, appropriate training?

Our systematic review is not without limitations. We selected the introduction of Publons training as our start date. It is possible that online training existed prior to this date. Nevertheless, the present results provide a comprehensive assessment of online training in the last decade. We only sought online openly accessible training resources, which is not the only training provided to peer reviewers. Be that as it may, in an era of equity, diversity, and inclusiveness, we think freely available opportunities provide the broadest opportunity for training, globally. Finally, it is unclear what risk of bias assessment is appropriate for methodological reviews, such as this one. We believed it best to use an assessment process used previously, rather than forego attempting to evaluate internal validity.

CONCLUSION

Future collaborative efforts should focus on the creation of a more unified manuscript peer review training program. To meaningfully promote improving peer review skills, publishers could require all new peer reviewers to complete training and certification prior to peer reviewing. Furthermore, manuscript peer review is a global activity and training must be available to everyone interested in developing skills to complete high quality peer review. Special attention should be given to making training more accessible, equitable and inclusive.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Tennant JP, Dugan JM, Graziotin D, Jacques DC, Waldner F, Mietchen D, et al. A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in Peer Review. F1000Research. 2017;6:1151. doi:10.12688/f1000research.12037.3.
2. Burnham JC. The Evolution of Editorial Peer Review. JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association. 1990;263:1323. doi:10.1001/jama.1990.03440100023003.
3. Nicholas D, Watkinson A, Jamali HR, Herman E, Tenopir C, Volentine R, et al. Peer Review: Still king in the Digital age. Learned Publishing. 2015;28:15–21. doi:10.1087/20150104.
4. Rowland F. The peer-review process. Learned Publishing. 2002;15:247–58. doi:10.1087/095315102760319206.
5. Kelly J, Sadeghieh T, Adeli K. Peer Review in Scientific Publications: Benefits, Critiques, & A Survival Guide. EJIFCC. 2014 Oct 24;25(3):227-43. PMID: 27683470; PMCID: PMC4975196.
6. Smith R. Peer Review: A Flawed Process at the Heart of Science and Journals. Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine. 2006;99(4):178-182. doi:10.1177/01410768060990041
7. Horbach SP, Halffman W(. The changing forms and expectations of Peer Review. Research Integrity and Peer Review 2018;3. doi:10.1186/s41073-018-0051-5.
8. Rennie D, Flanagin A. Three Decades of Peer Review Congresses. *JAMA.* 2018;319(4):350–353. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.20606
9. Ioannidis JPA, Berkwits M, Flanagin A, Godlee F, Bloom T. The Ninth International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication: A Call for Research. *JAMA.* 2019;322(17):1658–1660. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.15516
10. Nylenna M, Riis P, Karlsson Y. Multiple Blinded Reviews of the Same Two Manuscripts: Effects of Referee Characteristics and Publication Language. *JAMA.* 1994;272(2):149–151. doi:10.1001/jama.1994.03520020075021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

11. Squazzoni F, Grimaldo F, Marušić A. Publishing: Journals could share peer-review data. Nature 2017;546:352–. doi:10.1038/546352a.
12. Siler K, Lee K, Bero L. Measuring the effectiveness of scientific gatekeeping. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2014;112:360–5. doi:10.1073/pnas.1418218112.
13. Garfunkel JM, Ulshen MH, Hamrick HJ, Lawson EE. Problems Identified by Secondary Review of Accepted Manuscripts. *JAMA.* 1990;263(10):1369–1371. doi:10.1001/jama.1990.03440100077011
14. Lee CJ, Moher D. Promote scientific integrity via journal peer review data. Science. 2017 Jul 21;357(6348):256-257. doi: 10.1126/science.aan4141. PMID: 28729501.
15. D'Andrea R, O'Dwyer JP. Can editors save peer review from peer reviewers? PLOS ONE 2017;12. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0186111.
16. Superchi C, González JA, Solà I, Cobo E, Hren D, Boutron I. Tools used to assess the quality of peer review reports: A methodological systematic review. BMC Medical Research Methodology 2019;19. doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0688-x.
17. Song E, Ang L, Park J-Y, Jun E-Y, Kim KH, Jun J, et al. A scoping review on biomedical journal peer review guides for reviewers. PLOS ONE 2021;16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251440.
18. Bruce R, Chauvin A, Trinquart L, Ravaud P, Boutron I. Impact of interventions to improve the quality of peer review of Biomedical Journals: A Systematic Review and meta-analysis. BMC Medicine 2016;14. doi:10.1186/s12916-016-0631-5.
19. Patel J. Why training and specialization is needed for peer review: A case study of peer review for Randomized Controlled Trials. BMC Medicine 2014;12. doi:10.1186/s12916-014-0128-z.
20. Benos DJ, Bashari E, Chaves JM, Gaggar A, Kapoor N, LaFrance M, et al. The ups and downs of Peer Review. Advances in Physiology Education 2007;31:145–52. doi:10.1152/advan.00104.2006.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

21. Boutron I, Ravaud P. Misrepresentation and distortion of research in biomedical literature. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2018;115:2613–9. doi:10.1073/pnas.1710755115.
22. Jefferson T, Rudin M, Brodney Folse S, Davidoff F. Editorial peer review for improving the quality of reports of Biomedical Studies. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007;2010. doi:10.1002/14651858.mr000016.pub3.
23. Schroter S, Black N, Evans S, Carpenter J, Godlee F, Smith R. Effects of training on quality of peer review: Randomised Controlled Trial. BMJ 2004;328:673. doi:10.1136/bmj.38023.700775.ae.
24. Callaham ML, Wears RL, Waeckerle JF. Effect of attendance at a training session on peer reviewer quality and performance. Annals of Emergency Medicine 1998;32:318–22. doi:10.1016/s0196-0644(98)70007-1.
25. Galipeau J, Moher D, Campbell C, Hendry P, Cameron DW, Palepu A, et al. A systematic review highlights a knowledge gap regarding the effectiveness of health-related training programs in journalology. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 2015;68:257–65. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.09.024.
26. Mulligan A, Hall L, Raphael E. Peer Review in a changing world: An international study measuring the attitudes of researchers. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology 2012;64:132–61. doi:10.1002/asi.22798.
27. Ho RC-M, Mak K-K, Tao R, Lu Y, Day JR, Pan F. Views on the peer review system of biomedical journals: An online survey of academics from high-ranking universities. BMC Medical Research Methodology 2013;13. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-13-74.
28. Global State of Peer Review Survey. Publons. 2018. https://publons.com/static/Publons-Global-State-Of-Peer-Review-2018.pdf

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

29. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71
30. Willis JV, Cobey KD, Moher D, et al. Online training in manuscript peer review: a systematic review. Epub ahead of print September 2, 2022. DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/UAC3K.
31. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. Press peer review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 guideline statement. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2016;75:40–6. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.01.021.
32. Preston A, Johnston D. The Future of Academic Research. Epub ahead of print 9 December 2013. DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.871466.v1.
33. Peer reviewing research. Equator Network. https://www.equator-network.org/toolkits/peer-reviewing-research/.
34. Cukier S, Helal L, Rice DB, Pupkaite J, Ahmadzai N, Wilson M, et al. Checklists to detect potential predatory biomedical journals: A systematic review. BMC Medicine 2020;18. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01566-1.
35. Dickersin K. Free online course on journal Peer Review. Free Online Course on Journal Peer Review | Cochrane Eyes and Vision. 2012. https://eyes.cochrane.org/free-online-course-journal-peer-review.
36. Chandran L, Niebuhr V. Peer Review of Manuscripts: An Online Training Module. MedEdPORTAL 2013. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.9444.
37. Sainani K. 6.7: Doing a peer review - 6. Coursera. 2017. https://www.coursera.org/lecture/sciwrite/6-7-doing-a-peer-review-mu4ZE.
38. Veis D. Journal Peer Review: TIPS for writing an effective evaluation. ASBMR. 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vgg8-O_e2Q8.
39. Open Peer Review. FOSTER. 2018. https://www.fosteropenscience.eu/learning/open-peer-review/#/id/5a17e150c2af651d1e3b1bce.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

40. Tokalić R. A Peer Review Card Exchange Game. European Science Editing 2018. doi:10.20316/ese.2018.44.18007.
41. Chauvin A, Ravaud P, Moher D, Schriger D, Hopewell S, Shanahan D, et al. Accuracy in detecting inadequate research reporting by early career peer reviewers using an online consort-based peer-review tool (COBPeer) versus the usual peer-review process: A cross-sectional diagnostic study. BMC Medicine 2019;17. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1436-0.
42. Lovick J. How to be a peer reviewer. SAGE. 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wc0J35ixa3s
43. Stiller-Reeve M. How to master peer review. Nature Careers. 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C0cchYD9hpY.
44. Elsevier Researcher Academy - Certified Peer Reviewer Course. Elsevier. 2021. https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/navigating-peer-review/certified-peer-reviewer-course.
45. Marshall D. Peer reviewer training - how to get published euraxess webinar series. EURAXESS 2021. https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/worldwide/north-america/peer-reviewer-training-how-get-published-euraxess-webinar-series.
46. Excellence in peer review training programs. Taylor & Francis. 2022. https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/peer-review-training/.
47. Prep: The asha journals peer review excellence program. ASHA Journals Academy 2020. https://academy.pubs.asha.org/prep-the-asha-journals-peer-review-excellence-program/.
48. Reviewer training materials. The BMJ. https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-reviewers/training-materials
49. How to peer review. BMJ Journals 2019. https://authors.bmj.com/for-reviewers/how-to-peer-review/
50. Focus on Peer Review. Nature Masterclass. https://masterclasses.nature.com/online-course-on-peer-review/16507836.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

51. Reviewer certification. Optica Publishing Group. https://opg.optica.org/reviewer_certification/?module=getting_started&subnav=course_overview&slide=about_this_course
52. How to Peer Review. Springer Nature. https://www.springernature.com/gp/authors/campaigns/how-to-peer-review.
53. My Research Essentials: Peer Review. University of Manchester. https://www.escholar.manchester.ac.uk/learning-objects/mre/peer-review/story_html5.html.
54. "An Introduction to Peer Review." Web of Science Academy, https://webofscienceacademy.clarivate.com/learn/course/external/view/elearning/119/an-introduction-to-peer-review.
55. Journal Reviewers. Wiley. https://authorservices.wiley.com/Reviewers/journal-reviewers/index.html.
56. Peer reviewer training course. Wolters Kluwer. https://wkauthorservices.editage.com/peer-reviewer-training-course/.
57. Willis JV, Ramos J, Cobey KD, et al. Knowledge and motivations of training in peer review: an international cross-sectional survey. 2022.
58. Kleinert S, Horton R. How should medical science change? Lancet. 2014 Jan 18;383(9913):197-8. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62678-1. Epub 2014 Jan 8. PMID: 24411649.
59. Aczel B, Szaszi B, Holcombe AO. A billion-dollar donation: estimating the cost of researchers' time spent on peer review. Res Integr Peer Rev. 2021 Nov 14;6(1):14. doi: 10.1186/s41073-021-00118-2. PMID: 34776003; PMCID: PMC8591820.
60. #FeedbackASAP: Growing preprint review. ASAPbio 2022. https://asapbio.org/feedbackasap

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Appendix 1: OVID search strategy

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) ALL <1946 to July 09, 2021>

1 ((peer review? or peer reviewer? or peer reviewing) adj2 (train* or curriculum* or education* or workshop* or module* or tutorial* or toolkit* or guide* or learn* or course* or webinar* or mentor* or lesson* or teach* or instruct*)).tw,kf. (356)

2 Curriculum/ or Computer-Assisted Instruction/ or Inservice Training/ or Education, Professional/ or Interactive Tutorial/ (109923)

3 Peer Review, Research/ (7055)

4 (peer review? or peer reviewer? or peer reviewing).ti. (4762)

5 (peer review? or peer reviewer? or peer reviewing).ab. /freq=2 (1968)

6 or/3-5 (11424)

7 2 and 6 (117)

8 1 or 7 (451)

9 limit 8 to yr="2012-current" (201)

Appendix 2: Grey literature search strategy

Grey literature searches were done using the same inclusion and exclusion criteria as the OVID search.

- Forward and backward citation analysis of articles included at the data extraction stage was done using Web of Science on October 12, 2021.
- University library websites were searched on October 12, 2021. The Shanghai Ranking of World Universities 2020 (https://www.shanghairanking.com/rankings/arwu/2020) was used to identify the top 10 universities in each world region (Africa, Americas, Asian/Oceania, Europe). As our author group is based in Canada, we additionally searched the top 15 (U15) Canadian research university library sites on October 4, 2021.
- To better cover training material created by journals, we searched the top 6 biomedical publishers by journal count (Taylor & Francis, Elsevier, Springer, Wiley, SAGE, Wolters Kluwer Health), as well as publishers identified as having an interest in peer review (BMJ, AMA, eLife, PLOS, Frontiers) on October 12, 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

- Google (Oct 25, 2021) and YouTube (Oct 18, 2021) search of "peer review training" and "peer review course" limited to post-2012. Searches were done in an incognito browser. The results of each search were recorded, excluding search results from a publisher and replacing them until the first 100 results were recorded.
- Preprint server search using "peer reviewer training" on: OSF Preprints, bioRxiv, MediArXiv, EdArXiv, PeerJ, Preprints.org, PsyArXiv on October 12, 2021.
- Peer review groups/events that had a website were also be searched on October 12, 2021: EQUATOR Network (equator-network.org/), Publons (publons.com), PEERE (peere.org), and Peer Review Congress (peerreviewcongress.org/).

Appendix 3: Screening form

Level 1 (title/abstract):

1. Does this document describe training for peer reviewers of scientific documents? (yes/unclear; no)

If yes/unclear, move to Level 2 (full text):

1. Does this document describe training for peer reviewers of scientific documents? (yes/unclear; no)
2. Is there any reason to exclude the document? (yes/no)
    a. If yes, please specify:
        i. Not in English/French
        ii. Not published on or after January 1st, 2012
        iii. Not openly available
        iv. Other, please specify: ___

Appendix 4: Data extraction form

Item #	Item description	Answer options [*in italics, further instruction for extractor*]
1	DOI	*If no DOI, use website URL*
2	Author	*Extract the first listed corresponding author. If not, corresponding author is indicated, extract the first listed author. If reported as a group, extract group name. If not reported, write 'not reported'.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

3	Year of publication	*Use the most recent year stated on the document*
4	Country where training was developed	*If multiple countries are listed, specify 'multiple countries'*
5	Organization that developed the training	*If unclear, extract based on author from 2.* *If multiple organizations are listed, specify 'multiple organizations'*
6	Target audience	*i.e., was the training created for peer reviewers of a specific journal/publisher, university?* Yes, please specify: _____ No
7	Funding	Public Private Both private and public None Not reported
8	Training format	*Check all that apply.* Online module Website of resources In-person workshop Webinar/Zoom Online video (asynchronous) Other, describe: ___ Unsure
9	Is the training provided as part of a larger course/curriculum?	Yes, please specify: _____ No Unsure
10	Does the training report the length of	Yes, please specify: ___ If not reported, make an estimate: ____

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

	time it takes?	
11	Does the training provide proof of completion (i.e., certificate)?	Yes, please specify: ___ No Not reported
12	Are there any barriers to access the training online?	*Check all that apply.* No barriers Paywall, please specify amount: ___ Registration Membership, please specify for what: ___ Other, please specify: ___
13	Is the training offered in any other languages?	Yes, please specify: ___ No Unsure

14	What are the topics covered by the training?	*i.e., look at the sub-headings, table of contents if helpful*
		
		Check all that apply.
		
		• What is peer review
		• Types of peer review (e.g., open peer review)
		• How to write an effective peer review report
		• How to become a peer reviewer
		• Critical appraisal of…
		  ○ Methodology (randomization, interventions, etc.)
		  ○ Data and results
		  ○ Clinical trials
		  ○ Statistics
		  ○ Reporting guidelines (ex. CONSORT)
		  ○ Bias, conflict of interest, plagiarism, and misconduct
		  ○ Academic writing
		• Other, please specify: ___

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.02.22279345; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

15	Does the document report to have evaluated the peer review training described?	Yes No If yes, what study design was used? (Observational study, randomized trial, experiment, other, please specify: ___) If trial, briefly describe the participants and outcomes.

Appendix 5. Risk of bias form

Item #	Item	Answers
1	Do the authors represent more than one stakeholder group?	Yes/No/Not reported
2	Did the authors gather data (i.e., conduct a survey) for development of the training?	Yes/Only Citations/No/Not reported
3	Was the training pilot tested?	Yes/No/Not reported
4	Does the training provide clear learning objectives?	Yes/No/Unsure
5	Does the training provide some form of testing/evaluation to test learning?	Yes/No/Unsure
6	Does the training provide a feedback method?	Yes/No/Unsure