

# Valuing the IJTMB Manuscript Review Board

Antony J. Porcino, BSc, PhD (candidate)

*Complementary Medicine Education and Outcomes Research Program, British Columbia Cancer Agency, Vancouver, BC, Canada*

The honor of becoming Executive Editor of the IJTMB affords me increased appreciation for the process of research publishing. While authors work arduously to produce strong research and reporting, the Editorial Board, comprising six volunteers (<http://www.ijtmb.org/index.php/ijtmb/about/editorialTeam>) and a great team of support persons, works painstakingly to ensure quality research articles live in the IJTMB. As a critical part of producing each journal issue, the Editorial Board coordinates the Journal's network of volunteer reviewers, the Manuscript Review Board (MRB). I'd like to present and thank the IJTMB MRB reviewers\* of the past three years:

Katie Adams  
Derek Austin  
John Balletto  
Amanda Baskwill  
Peter Becker  
Susan Bessonette  
Karen Boulanger  
Anne Brodie  
Marissa Brooks  
Celia Bucci  
Elaine Calenda  
Jerrilyn Cambron  
Susan Chapelle  
Rosemary Chunco  
Laurie Craig  
Michael Donnelly  
Edward Feinberg  
Paul Finch  
Thomas Findley  
Pamela Fitch  
Cathy Fournier  
Sandy Fritz  
Kimberly Goral  
Donelda Gowan-Moody  
Keith Grant  
Michael Hamm  
Bodhi Haraldsson  
Kate Henriouille  
Sandra Hilton

Glenn Hymel  
Colby Inzer  
Steve Jurch  
Janet Kahn  
Ania Kania  
Ronald Kettering  
Kim Lemoon  
Whitney Lowe  
Martha Menard  
Lisa Mertz  
Albert Moraska  
Christopher Moyer  
Sonya Munk  
Armijo Olivo  
Darlene Peters  
Grant Rich  
Melody Rudolph  
Joellen Sefton  
Marybetts Sinclair  
Matthew Stewart  
Tim Tanaka  
Lesley Teitelbaum  
Robin Thomas  
Diana Thompson  
Ravensara Travillian  
Charlotte Versagi  
Ruth Werner  
Pete Whitridge

\*(with apologies and requests for overlooked names)

The work of reviewers is the lifeblood of an effective and rigorous peer-reviewed journal. Personal time spent and dedication are the cornerstones. Each submitted article must receive written reviews from at least two reviewers. The reviewers read each article several times, make notes on their observations about the background they are supplied within the article, and consider the research approach and methods, including whether those are appropriate to the question(s) and objectives being addressed in the article. They carefully review the results, how they were achieved, interpreted, and presented. Finally, they analyze the discussion to consider whether it pulls everything together and whether the objectives of the project were actually achieved. They also examine whether the writing is helping or hindering the reading of the article. They then write a response, drawing on what they have observed and on their own expertise, in order to create a review that carefully, but helpfully, leads the author(s) to creating a successful journal article.

Becoming the Executive Editor has emphasized for me the importance of the peer review process. With all the options now possible for self-publication and promotion, some argue that it isn't important, at least in its current form<sup>(1)</sup>. Additionally, Internet publishing offers many ways of circumventing peer review or reducing its effectiveness<sup>(2)</sup>, yet the soundness of quality, ethical peer review remains important in today's electronic media society<sup>(3)</sup>. IJTMB's peer review ensures appropriateness and rigor in the research that establishes the future of our therapeutic massage and bodywork professions. As a peer-reviewed journal in a young field of research, the IJTMB has a careful balancing act if it is not to overly burden its reviewers. Issues include: (a) the pool of experienced research persons to draw on to create its MRB is still growing; (b) specific areas of researcher expertise and knowledge may be very limited because the actual methods of researching in therapeutic massage and bodywork are still being refined; (c) and many researchers, authors, and peer reviewers may not have much publication or peer-review experience. Each of these concerns carries its own area of work for the Editorial Board. I will work over the next few

years to expand our MRB and increase our education for reviewers, in order to maintain quality and rigor in the articles that the IJTMB publishes. I am grateful, and I am sure the readers are grateful, for those who have worked to help our body of knowledge grow, and for the many people developing research expertise in their fields of therapeutic massage and bodywork service.

The development of the IJTMB MRB has been organic, and has drawn interest from many great colleagues and researchers internationally within the therapeutic massage and bodywork field. With three years under its publication belt, we're ready to start tweaking some processes for the Journal so that we can serve authors and readers even better. The Editorial Board will be reviewing the MRB development process this summer.

I would like to encourage more people to consider being a peer-reviewer for the Journal. If you are interested and would like to be contacted, please send me an email.

Finally, my hat is off to the several journal editors below, who have inspired me with their recent editorials on peer review:

- Rita Redberg, (Redberg R. Annual Reviewers List. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 2012;172(6): 458–460)
- Roger Watson (Watson R. Peer review under the spotlight in the UK. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2012;68(4):718–720)
- Leon Chaitow (Chaitow L. Recognizing reviewers. *Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies*. 2012;16(1):1)

And yes, this editorial was also peer-reviewed.

Antony J. Porcino,  
BSc, PhD (candidate)  
Executive Editor, IJTMB

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST NOTIFICATION

The author declares there are no conflicts of interest.

## COPYRIGHT

Published under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

## REFERENCES

- 1 The Editors. Rethinking Peer Review. *The New Atlantis*. 2006;13(Summer):106–110. Available from: <http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/rethinking-peer-review>. Accessed May 30, 2012.
- 2 Stratford M. 'Predatory' Online Journals Lure Scholars Who Are Eager to Publish. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Published March 4, 2012. <http://chronicle.com/article/Predatory-Online-Journals/131047/>. Accessed March 8, 2012.
- 3 Science and Technology Committee, House of Commons. *Peer Review in Scientific Publications*. Report HC 856. London, UK: The Stationary Office; 2011. p.254. Available from: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmsctech/856/856.pdf>. Accessed March 8, 2012.