

EDITORIAL

SCIENCE AND SCOPE OF PEER REVIEW

The Manuscripts are accepted / rejected at two key levels, the editor's level and the peer review level.

Scientific Peer Review has been defined as the evaluation of research findings for competence, significance and originality by a qualified expert, to reduce the chances of misinformation and confusion.

Harto R. (2002) reported in JAMA that Royal Society of Edinburgh published first peer-review collection of medical articles entitled "Medical Essays and Observation" in 1731. The Royal Society of Edinburgh recognized that stamp of peer review did not necessarily mean the work was better than non-peer reviewed publications.

The general public expects a peer-reviewed publication to be free of dishonesty. The public disclosure of scientific transgressions by Korean stem cell biologist Wook Suk Hwang and young US scientist Jan Hendrick Schon at Bell Laboratories highlighted the failures of peer review in detecting intentional misconduct. The fraud in above two cases has been both at internal peer review process and the reviewers of these high profile journals.

Peer Review is expected to influence the publication in following categories:

- i). too much information
 - ii) too little information
 - iii) inaccurate information
 - iv) misplaced information
 - v) structural problems
- (Purecell GP et all, 1998)

Plagorism is an other new area which reviewers must keep in mind while reviewing a manuscript.

Rumsey T.S. (1999) defined "Bias" in peer review as systematic prejudice that prevent the accurate and objective interpretation of scientific studies and reported three common biases: (i). status (ii). gender (iii). research theme of scientific studies. Llyod (1990) reported that female-authored manuscripts were accepted significantly more often by female reviewers (62%) as compared to male authored manuscripts (10%). The male reviewers did not discriminate between male-or female-authored manuscript in terms of acceptance rate. In the Annals of King Edward Medical University the peer review is strictly performed according to the editorial policy and the names of the peer reviewers are published in each issue.

The readers of Annals of King Edward Medical University are requested that while reading the paper they may also review the paper. In case they find any scientific error or misconduct they are invited to write letter to the editor.

Prof. Syed Muhammad Awais

(Sitara-e-Imtiaz)

Editor