

The Peer Review Process: Perspectives of Researchers

T. Grady Roberts¹
Amy Harder²
James R. Lindner³

Abstract

The peer review process for articles is a critical component of ensuring the quality of research. This study explores the experiences of researchers in agricultural education with the peer review process. This study is part of a larger study that also examined the perspectives of peer reviewers. We used a survey to collect data from a random sample of researchers who had published in seven different journals related to agricultural education. We had 113 researchers respond. Participants experienced lengthy review processes and were generally dissatisfied with the current situation. There was an inverse relationship between satisfaction and the time between submission and publication. Participants also raised concerns about the sustainability of our current practices due to the lack of willing reviewers. Our study's results suggest editors would be well-served by identifying ethical strategies to improve the peer review process that increase efficiency without sacrificing quality and integrity

Introduction

We all have probably heard the *publish or perish* phrase. Publishing in peer-reviewed journals is critical for promotion and tenure (Harley et al., 2010; Niles et al., 2020) and career progression (Johnson et al., 2018). Researchers believe that their total number of publications, their number of publications per year, and the reputation of the journals where they publish are important factors in the promotion and tenure process (Niles et al., 2020). Beyond the assessment of individual researchers, publications are also used to rank academic departments (Camp et al., 1987; Sziklai, 2021) and universities (Vernon et al., 2018).

Deciding where to publish can be daunting for researchers. In 2018, over 33,000 peer-reviewed research journals were published in English (Johnson et al., 2018), so researchers have many choices about where to publish their work. Researchers select journals based on the quality of reviews (Björk & Öörni, 2009; Mabe & Mulligan, 2011; Rowley et al., 2020), timeliness of peer reviews (Chong & Lin, 2023; Mabe & Mulligan, 2011; Rowley et al., 2020), overall time to publication (Björk & Öörni, 2009; Mabe & Mulligan, 2011; Solomon & Björk, 2012; Wijewickrema & Petras, 2017), and journal reputation (Gaston et al., 2020; Mabe & Mulligan, 2011; Rowley et al., 2020; Wijewickrema & Petras, 2017).

Authors' individual experiences with peer review can influence their research and publishing behaviors and self-efficacy (Kozhakhmet et al., 2020). Peer review results can be incredibly influential on early career researchers who feel pressured to publish (Harley et al., 2010; Niles et al., 2020) and are still forming their professional identities as researchers (Mula et al., 2022).

Peer review plays a critical role in the research process, and researchers generally value the peer review process (Mulligan et al., 2013). However, the peer review process faces criticism. One large study

¹ T. Grady Roberts is a Professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Agricultural Education and Communication at the University of Florida, PO Box 110540, Gainesville, FL 32611-0540, groberts@ufl.edu, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7618-7850>

² Amy Harder is a Professor and Associate Dean of Extension at the University of Connecticut, W.B. Young Building, Room 233, Storrs, CT 06269-4066, amy.harder@uconn.edu, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7042-2028>

³ James R. Lindner is a Professor of Agriscience in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Auburn University, 5050 Haley Center, Auburn, AL 36849, JRL0039@auburn.edu, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1448-3846>

showed that over two-thirds of researchers believe the current system can be improved (Mulligan et al., 2013). Some key findings from Mulligan et al. (2013) include that researchers believe peer review plays an important role in scholarly publishing, the primary purpose of peer review should be to improve a paper, double-blind peer review is the most effective, and the review process can be too slow. Many of us are familiar with the infamous Reviewer #2, who gives unreasonably harsh and rude feedback to researchers (Watling et al., 2021). These bad peer reviews can stimulate imposter syndrome for researchers and impact future submissions to the journal (Watling et al., 2021).

Some additional critiques of the current review process include interrater reliability (Bornmann et al., 2010; Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020; Waltman et al., 2023), lack of transparency (Waltman et al., 2023; Wolfram et al., 2020), variability across disciplines (Rowley & Scaffi, 2018; Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020), inconsistent standards between journals (Lauria, 2023; Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020), biases towards certain groups (Smith et al., 2023; Teplitskiy et al., 2018; Waltman et al., 2023), and reliance on a small pool of reviewers (Fox et al., 2017; Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020). The length of time for peer review has been routinely criticized (Horta & Jung, 2024). Huisman and Smits (2017) studied peer reviews of 3,500 researchers across many fields. They found that researchers generally think the review process takes too long, with articles in the social sciences taking 17 weeks on average for the first decision from an editor. As experienced researchers, we have personally dealt with delays in the review process. For example, the peer review process for this article took 10 weeks and required asking 5 different potential peer reviewers to get two reviews completed (B. Lawver, personal communication, July 6, 2025).

Compounding the challenges we face related to peer review is the explosion of new journals and exponential growth in the number of articles, with one estimate showing a 59% increase in the number of articles published between 2012 and 2022 (National Science Board, National Science Foundation, 2023). This increase in published articles has also impacted the number of peer reviews required. Reviewers report being burdened by the number of reviews they are invited to perform (Severin & Chataway, 2021). One study estimated that globally, reviewers spent over 100 million hours reviewing articles in 2020, which equates to 15 thousand years (Aczel et al., 2021). Delays in publishing cause stress and dissatisfaction among researchers (Huisman & Smits, 2017). This, in part, contributed to the growth of predatory journals, which are preying on researchers eager to quickly publish their work (Mills & Inouye, 2021).

The importance of peer review calls for a deeper understanding of this process, especially from the perspectives of the people most impacted – researchers. This study focuses on the discipline of agricultural education, which we define as inclusive of research on education, extension, human capacity building, diffusion of innovations, leadership, and communication within the context of food, agriculture, and natural resources. There has been no previous research on peer review in agricultural education. This study will fill the gap on peer review in agricultural education from the perspectives of agricultural education researchers.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of agricultural education researchers with the peer review process. The objectives of the study were to:

1. Describe participants' experiences with, and perceptions of, the timeliness of the publication process.
2. Describe attitudes toward and satisfaction with the peer review process.
3. Explore and describe the relationships between participant attitudes toward the peer review process and satisfaction with the peer review process.
4. Explore and describe the relationships between satisfaction with the peer review process and selected participant characteristics.

Methodology

This study was a part of a larger study that also looked at perspectives of the peer review process (Roberts et al., 2025). The sampling, instrumentation, and data collection for both studies were the same. Therefore, the methods sections of both papers were similar.

Population and Sample

This study's population was all active agricultural education researchers in 2023. The data for this study were collected in 2024. Our population frame was established based on authors and coauthors on articles published in 2019-2023 in any of the following journals: *Advancements in Agricultural Development*, *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, *Journal of Extension*, *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension*, and the *NACTA Journal*. Our frame was 2,830 unduplicated researchers, with 318 researchers who had published in multiple journals and 2,512 researchers who had published in only one journal. Contact information was obtained through journal websites, university websites, and Internet searches. We selected a stratified randomized sample of 340 researchers, with 25% ($n = 85$) researchers with researchers who had published in more than one of these journals and 75% ($n = 255$) who had published in only one. Stratification of the sample was done to ensure a sufficient number of researchers with two or more papers for statistical analysis. Researchers whose emails bounced on initial contact were randomly replaced from the population frame to maintain the sample size.

Instrumentation

Our instrument was designed to measure both author's and reviewer's perspectives of the peer review process. Portions of the instrument were researcher-developed based on the literature, and portions were adapted directly from Mulligan et al. (2013). The instrument was designed in two sections. Section one was presented to all researchers and focused on the author's experiences. Section two focused on the reviewer's experiences and was presented to researchers who self-identified as having been a peer reviewer. Section one had four parts: (a) perceptions of the peer review process, measured with ten items using a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree; (b) research publication history, measured with three items; (c) perceptions of the length of time of their last peer review, measured with one item on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree; and (d) overall perceptions of the peer review process, measured with a single item on a five-point scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. Section two had four sections: (a) reviewer experiences, measured with six items; (b) review process, measured with four items; (c) reasons for reviewing, measured 17 items on a five-point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree or agree, agree, strongly agree); and (d) professional demographics, measured with ten items. Interpretations of the scale are based on Lindner and Lindner (2024); 1.00 to 1.50 = strongly disagree, 1.51 to 2.50 = disagree, 2.51 to 3.50 = neither disagree or agree, 3.51 to 4.50 = agree, 4.51 to 5.00 = strongly agree; and 1.00 to 1.50 = strongly dissatisfied, 1.51 to 2.50 = dissatisfied, 2.51 to 3.50 = neither dissatisfied or satisfied, 3.51 to 4.50 = satisfied, 4.51 to 5.00 = strongly satisfied. To estimate reliability, *t-tests* were performed on a randomly split file of cases to simulate a test-retest reliability estimate (Field, 2017). No statistical differences were detected in attitudes toward the peer review process ($t = .76, p = .45$), attitudes toward reasons for reviewing ($t = .35, p = .36$), timeliness with the process ($t = .35, p = .37$), and overall satisfaction ($t = .99, p = .16$), providing evidence of reliability. Face, content, and construct validity were established by a review of the instrument by seven experienced agricultural education researchers. Minor adjustments were made based on feedback from these experts.

Data Collection

Data were collected via Qualtrics. An initial notice was sent via email outside of Qualtrics. An email with a link to the questionnaire was sent two days later through Qualtrics. Three reminders were sent to nonrespondents at 5, 14, and 20 days based on monitoring when responses ceased after each notification. This resulted in 113 responses (33.2%). Early versus late comparisons on primary variables of the study were made to control for nonresponse error (Lindner et al., 2001). No statistical differences in early versus late responses were found. This provides evidence of generalizability to the study population.

Participants in the study were overwhelmingly faculty ($f = 100$, 89.3%), and a small portion were graduate students ($f = 12$, 10.7%). Faculty also tended to be the corresponding author ($f = 73$, 85.9%) on papers submitted to agricultural education journals. Participants indicated the discipline or specialization that best described them: agricultural education ($f = 20$, 32.8%); agricultural extension or extension education ($f = 14$, 23%); community development ($f = 7$, 11.5%); agricultural communications and journalism ($f = 5$, 8.2%); leadership education ($f = 4$, 6.6%); technical field (non-social science) ($f = 4$, 6.6%); and other ($f = 7$, 11.5%). Faculty participants indicated the title: Professor ($f = 27$, 45.8%); Associate Professor ($f = 13$, 22%); Assistant Professor ($f = 12$, 20.3%); Senior Lecturer or Lecturer ($f = 2$, 2.4%); and Other ($f = 5$, 8.5%). Over a quarter of the participants ($f = 30$, 25.9%) were members of the *American Association for Agricultural Education*, 21.6% ($f = 25$) were members of *North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture*, and 15.5% ($f = 18$) were members of the *Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education*. On average, participants allocated 38.19% of their time to teaching, 26.94% to research, 14.16% to administration, 10.56% to extension, 6.23% to service, and 3.92% to outreach. Over half of the faculty participants ($f = 62$, 54.8%) indicated that they had served as a journal editor or member of a journal editorial board.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and correlational analysis of study data were conducted using SPSS version 30. Relationships among variables were described using Spearman's rho (ρ) bivariate correlations. Interpretations of statistically significant correlations were made based on Davis' (1971) convention. As needed for analysis and presentation, some data were collected at the interval level and recategorized for analysis and presentation. For example, the weeks from submission to publication were open-ended and recategorized into four categories.

Findings

Authors' Experiences

The first objective of this study was to describe participants' experiences with, and perceptions of, the timeliness of the review process. Table 1 shows that participants indicated that it took 25% in each of the following categories of time from submission to publication: 0 to 15 (24.4%), 16 to 25 (25.6%), 26 to 44 (23.3%), and 45 or more (26.7%). The mean number of weeks from submission to publication was 30.02 ($SD = 19.96$).

Table 1

Weeks from Article Submission to Publication

Number of Weeks	<i>f</i>	%
0 to 15	21	24.4
16 to 25	22	25.6
26 to 44	20	23.3
45 or more	23	26.7

Note. *M* = 30.02, *SD* = 19.96:

Table 2 shows participants' level of agreement with the appropriateness of time it took in weeks from submission to publication. Participants, overall, neither agreed or disagreed (*M* = 2.57, *SD* = 1.21) that the time from submission to publication was appropriate. Over a third (33.7%) of participants disagreed that time from submission to publication was appropriate, while almost 28% of participants agreed that time from submission to publication was appropriate.

Table 2

Appropriateness of time in Weeks from Article Submission to Publication

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%		
Time from submission to publication was appropriate	3	3.5	24	27.9	11	12.8	29	33.7	19	22.1	2.57	1.21

Note. Valid Percentages of Respondents was used; Scale: 1 to 1.5 = strongly disagree, 1.51 to 2.5 = disagree, 2.51 to 3.5 = neither disagree or agree, 3.51 to 4.5 = agree, 4.51 to 5 = strongly agree

Authors' Attitudes and Satisfaction with the Peer Review Process

The study's second objective was to describe participant attitudes toward and satisfaction with the peer review process. As shown in Table 3, participants tended to agree that *scientific communication was greatly helped by peer review of published journal papers* (*M* = 4.23, *SD* = .71), *peer review was a concept well understood by the scientific community* (*M* = 3.98, *SD* = .96), *without peer review there was no control in scientific communication* (*M* = 3.97, *SD* = .91), and that *it was reasonable that journal editors evaluate and reject a proportion of articles prior to the external peer review* (*M* = 3.78, *SD* = .93). Participants tended to disagree that *the current peer review system was the best we can achieve* (*M* = 2.47, *SD* = .97), *peer review was a concept understood by the public* (*M* = 2.45, *SD* = 1.04), and *peer review was holding back scientific communication* (*M* = 2.45, *SD* = 1.00).

Table 3

Level of Agreement with the Peer Review Process

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Scientific communication is greatly helped by peer review of published journal papers	32	37.2	44	51.2	8	9.3	2	2.3	0		
Peer review is a concept well understood by the scientific community	27	31.4	40	46.5	10	11.6	8	9.3	1	1.2	3.98	0.96
Without peer review there is no control in scientific communication	26	30.2	38	44.2	16	18.6	5	5.8	1	1.2	3.97	0.91
It is reasonable that journal editors evaluate and reject a proportion of articles prior to the external peer review	15	17.4	49	57.0	12	14.0	8	9.3	2	2.3	3.78	0.93
Peer review in journals needs a complete overhaul	5	5.8	25	29.1	28	32.6	22	25.6	6	7.0	3.01	1.04
Peer review is unsustainable because there are too few willing reviewers	4	4.7	23	26.7	27	31.4	23	26.7	9	10.5	2.88	1.07
Peer review is biased against authors who are from developing countries	2	2.3	16	18.6	36	41.9	20	23.3	12	14.0	2.72	1.00
The current peer review system is the best we can achieve	2	1.8	12	14.0	17	19.8	48	42.9	7	8.1	2.47	0.92
Peer review is a concept understood by the public	3	2.7	14	16.3	14	16.3	43	38.4	12	14.0	2.45	1.04
Peer review is holding back scientific communication	2	2.3	13	15.1	20	23.3	38	44.2	13	15.1	2.45	1.00

Note. Valid Percentages of Respondents was used; Scale: 1 to 1.5 = strongly disagree, 1.51 to 2.5 = disagree, 2.51 to 3.5 = neither disagree or agree, 3.51 to 4.5 = agree, 4.51 to 5 = strongly agree

Table 4 shows that participants tended to be neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ($M = 2.77$, $SD = .97$) with the peer review process in agricultural education. Almost a third (31.9%) of participants indicated that they were dissatisfied with the peer review process in agricultural education.

Table 4

Satisfaction with Peer Review Process in Agricultural Education

Statement	Very Satisfied		Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied				Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Satisfaction	1	0.9	24	21.2	20	17.7	36	31.9	5	4.4	2.77	0.97

Note. Scale: 1-1.5 = strongly dissatisfied, 1.51-2.5 = dissatisfied, 2.51-3.5 = neither dissatisfied or satisfied, 3.51-4.5 = satisfied, 4.51-5 = strongly satisfied

Relationships between Attitudes and Satisfaction

The third objective of the study was to explore and describe the relationships between participant attitudes toward the peer review process and satisfaction with the peer review process. Spearman's rho (ρ) bivariate correlations were calculated to describe the correlations between variables, as shown in Table 5. Statistically significant and positive relationships were found between *satisfaction with the peer review process* and *scientific communication was greatly helped by peer review of published journal papers* ($\rho = .25$) and that *the current peer review system is the best we can achieve* ($\rho = .22$). Participants were more likely to be satisfied with the peer review process when they tended to agree that scientific communication was greatly helped by peer review of published journal papers. Statistically significant and negative relationships were found between *satisfaction with the peer review process* and *peer review in journals needs a complete overhaul* ($\rho = -.24$), *peer review was unsustainable because there are too few willing reviewers* ($\rho = -.26$), and *peer review was holding back scientific communication* ($\rho = -.26$). The more participants were dissatisfied with the peer review process, the more they tended to agree that peer review in journals needs a complete overhaul, peer review is unsustainable because there are too few willing reviewers, and peer review is holding back scientific communication.

Table 5

Relationship by Satisfaction and Attitudes

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.	i.	j.	k.
a. Satisfaction with peer review process	—										
b. Scientific communication is greatly helped by peer review of published journal papers	.25*	—									
c. Peer review is a concept well understood by the scientific community	.17	.21	—								
d. Without peer review there is no control in scientific communication	.14	.39*	.10	—							
e. It is reasonable that journal editors evaluate and reject a proportion of articles prior to the external peer review	.18	.09	.13	.23	—						
f. Peer review in journals needs a complete overhaul	-.24*	-.26*	-.13	-.11	-.12	—					
g. Peer review is unsustainable because there are too few willing reviewers	-.26*	-.18	.04	-.15	-.18	.40*	—				
h. Peer review is biased against authors who are from developing countries	-.15	-.10	-.11	-.10	-.11	.31*	.19	—			
i. The current peer review system is the best we can achieve	.22*	.10	.30*	.08	.11	-.32*	-.21	-.14	—		
j. Peer review is a concept understood by the public	.09	.04	.16	.01	.11	.03	-.05	.01	.30*	—	
k. Peer review is holding back scientific communication	-.26*	-.26*	-.10	-.22*	-.07	.45*	.30*	.39*	-.11	.08	—

Note. * = $p < .05$

Relationships between Author Characteristics and Satisfaction with Peer Review

The fourth objective of the study was to explore and describe the relationships between personal characteristics and attitudes toward satisfaction with the peer review process. Spearman's rho (ρ) bivariate correlations were calculated to describe the correlations between variables, as shown in Table 6. A statistically significant and positive relationship was found between *satisfaction with the peer review process* and *weeks to submission appropriateness* ($\rho = .35$). A statistically significant and negative relationship was found between *satisfaction with the peer review process* and *the number of weeks from submission to publication* ($\rho = -.29$). Participants were more satisfied with the peer review process when they indicated the time it took from submission to publication was appropriate. Participants were more satisfied with the peer review process when the number of weeks from submission to publication declined.

Table 6

Relationship between Selected Characteristics and Satisfaction

	Satisfaction with Peer Review Process
	ρ
Number of articles published in career	.07
Weeks from submission to publication	-.29*
Weeks submission to appropriateness	.35*
Rank	.18
Editor role	.01
Effort allocated to teaching	-.08
Effort allocated to research	-.07
Effort allocated to administration	-.04
Effort allocated to extension	.00
Effort allocated to service	-.17
Effort allocated to outreach	.26

Note. * = $p < .05$

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

The authors' experiences in our study tended to be characterized by lengthy review processes and dissatisfaction, yet they still believed in the value of peer review processes. Authors who felt the current peer review system is the best we can achieve also tended to believe that peer review is a concept understood by the scientific community and the public. However, authors who believe that peer review needs a complete overhaul had related concerns about peer review holding back scientific communication, biases against authors from developing countries, and too few willing peer reviewers. Satisfaction with the peer review system was related to perceptions of the timeliness of the process but not to any personal characteristics.

Researchers across disciplines often are dissatisfied with the timeliness of the peer review process (Horta & Jung, 2024). Over half of our study's authors experienced publication processes that lasted six months or more, similar to what Huisman and Smits (2017) found across social sciences fields. Practically, this creates trade-offs between a process meant to ensure standards of quality research are met (Gilliland & Cortina, 1997) and the speed with which results can be disseminated to the profession to impact practice. Lengthier processes can have a negative impact on individuals working to progress through the promotion and tenure (or equivalent) process, given the rigidity of the time frames for that process and the time needed to develop a robust line of inquiry.

Anecdotally, we have heard many discussions throughout our careers by faculty and graduate students who made decisions about where to submit their work based on expectations about the timeliness of the journal's review and publication processes. This may result in work being published in outlets that are not the most appropriate for reaching the intended audience (therefore impacting the likelihood the results are put into practice) and/or authors succumbing to the temptation to submit their work to publishers known to be, or suspected to be, predatory because of their quick turnaround times (Kurt, 2018; Mertkan et al., 2021). Neither outcome advances our profession in positive ways.

More authors were dissatisfied than satisfied with the peer review process in agricultural education. The relative dissatisfaction we found in our study contrasted with the higher levels of satisfaction identified across 12 broad fields by Mulligan et al. (2013). However, our study found a higher percentage of authors had positive views of peer review as a positive tool for scientific communication than the Mulligan et al. study. These results imply that we have uniquely poor peer review systems prevalent in agricultural education, and/or the quality of peer review systems has declined over the past decade. The proverbial silver lining may be found in agricultural education authors' continued appreciation for the *value* of peer review, if not the process itself. Reform is needed.

As our profession considers reform, we should reflect upon the criticisms associated with the belief that the system needs a complete overhaul: (a) peer review is holding back scientific communication, (b) bias exists against authors from developing countries, and (c) a lack of sustainability due to too few willing reviewers. Given the identified issues with the timeliness of the publication process, it is reasonable to hypothesize that this criticism is likely related to the delays that peer review causes in scientific communication efforts. Journal editors should seek to implement ethical strategies to move quality manuscripts through the publication process faster; the global Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) may be a valuable resource in this effort. Further, COPE offers guidance on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in publishing. AI is widely considered to have the potential to level the playing field for researchers from developing countries (OECD, 2023). Our journals must consider how to integrate this technology, develop appropriate policies, and be willing to review and revise those policies to reflect the rapid rate of change associated with AI.

The final criticism associated with a desire to overhaul the peer review system is its unsustainability due to a lack of willing reviewers. Only one-third of our study's respondents tended to agree that a lack of willing reviewers was an issue, though that was still 10% more agreement than what was found by Mulligan et al. (2013). The explosive growth of the journal industry (National Science Board, National Science Foundation, 2023) shows few signs of slowing and may cause more authors to have concerns if their publishing experiences are negatively impacted. In the past year, two of this study's authors had manuscripts returned without review by editors of two different journals, the stated reason being a lack of willing reviewers. If Aczel et al.'s (2021) estimate of 100 million hours of time needed for reviews *in a single year* is reasonably accurate, and the number of tenured positions at U.S. universities continues to decrease while adjunct positions increase (American Association of University Professors, 2023), the demand for reviewers will surpass the available supply. The author experience is unlikely to improve until some of these core issues are addressed.

The importance of an author's experience was evident when examining characteristics related to satisfaction with the peer review process. Authors tended to have more negative views of the process when it took longer for a manuscript to move from submission to publication, leading to the conclusion that timeliness is an important component of the publication process, as noted by Chong and Lin (2023), Mabe and Mulligan (2011), and Rowley et al. (2020). If the review process is perceived to be too long, as suggested by Horta and Jung (2024), Huisman and Smits (2017), and some of our respondents, then a possible reason for those negative feelings is that authors do not find the extra time adds value to their work

or improves the end product. It simply delays the authors' abilities to publish their work in an acceptable time frame. Perhaps authors would be more patient in return for a higher-quality experience, or willing to wait longer for a chance at publishing in journals with outstanding reputations and well-deserved impact factors; these questions are worth investigating for journals seeking to improve their publication models and increase their appeal to researchers.

The peer review process is not perfect, yet it fulfills a meaningful role in disseminating research. Our study's results suggest editors would be well-served by identifying ethical strategies to improve the peer review process that increase efficiency without sacrificing quality and integrity. We encourage our profession to have a dialogue within and across journals so that we may collectively work towards improvements benefiting our discipline. Together, we can create solutions that improve the author experience and ensure stakeholders have timely access to the research they need to address the challenges they face. These are goals worth working towards.

References

- Aczel, B., Szaszi, B., & Holcombe, A. O. (2021). A billion-dollar donation: Estimating the cost of researchers' time spent on peer review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 6(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-021-00118-2>
- American Association of University Professors. (2023, March). *Data snapshot: Tenure and contingency in U.S. higher education*. <https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/AAUP%20Data%20Snapshot.pdf>
- Björk, B.-C., & Öörni, A. (2009). A method for comparing scholarly journals as service providers to authors. *Serials Review*, 35(2), 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.serrev.2009.03.001>
- Bornmann, L., Mutz, R., & Daniel, H.-D. (2010). A reliability-generalization study of journal peer reviews: A multilevel meta-analysis of inter-rater reliability and its determinants. *PLoS One*, 5(12), e14331. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0014331>
- Camp, W. G., Hillison, J., & Jeffreys, B. J. (1987). Peer rankings of the leading agricultural teacher education programs. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 28(4), 2–8. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jaatea.1987.04002>
- Chong, S. W., & Lin, T. (2023). Feedback practices in journal peer-review: a systematic literature review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2164757>
- Davis, J. A. (1971). *Elementary survey analysis*. Prentice-Hall.
- Field, A. (2017). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.
- Fox, C. W., Albert, A. Y., & Vines, T. H. (2017). Recruitment of reviewers is becoming harder at some journals: a test of the influence of reviewer fatigue at six journals in ecology and evolution. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 2, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-017-0027-x>
- Gaston, T. E., Ounsworth, F., Senders, T., Ritchie, S., & Jones, E. (2020). Factors affecting journal submission numbers: Impact factor and peer review reputation. *Learned Publishing*, 33(2), 154-162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1285>

- Gilliland, S. W., & Cortina, J. M. (1997). Reviewer and editor decision making in the journal review process. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 427-452.
- Harley, D., Acord, S. K., Earl-Novell, S., Lawrence, S., & King, C. J. (2010). *Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: An exploration of faculty values and needs in seven disciplines*. Center for Studies in Higher Education, UC Berkeley.
<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/15x7385g>
- Horta, H., & Jung, J. (2024). The crisis of peer review: Part of the evolution of science. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 78(4), e12511. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12511>
- Huisman, J., & Smits, J. (2017). Duration and quality of the peer review process: The author's perspective. *Scientometrics*, 113(1), 633-650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2310-5>
- Johnson, R., Watkinson, A., & Mabe, M. (2018). *The STM report 1968-2018*. International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers. https://www.stm-assoc.org/2018_10_04_STM_Report_2018.pdf
- Kozhakhmet, S., Moldashev, K., Yenikeeva, A., & Nurgabdeshev, A. (2020). How training and development practices contribute to research productivity: A moderated mediation model. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(2), 437-449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1754782>
- Kurt, S. (2018). Why do authors publish in predatory journals? *Learned Publishing*, 31(2), 141-147. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1150>
- Lauria, M. (2023). Reviewing peer review: A flawed system: With immense potential. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 178-190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22798>
- Lindner, J. R., & Lindner, N. (2024). Interpreting Likert type, summated, unidimensional, and attitudinal scales: I neither agree nor disagree, Likert or not. *Advancements in Agricultural Development*, 5(2), 152-163. <https://doi.org/10.37433/aad.v5i2.351>
- Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43-53. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2001.04043>
- Mabe, M., & Mulligan, A. (2011). What journal authors want: Ten years of results from Elsevier's author feedback programme. *New Review of Information Networking*, 16(1), 71-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614576.2011.574495>
- Mertkan, S., Aliusta, G. O., & Suphi, N. (2021). Profile of authors publishing in "predatory" journals and causal factors behind their decision: A systematic review. *Research Evaluation*, 30(4), 470-483. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvab032>
- Mills, D., & Inouye, K. (2021). Problematizing 'predatory publishing': A systematic review of factors shaping publishing motives, decisions, and experiences. *Learned Publishing*, 34(2), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1325>
- Mula, J., Rodríguez, C. L., Domingo Segovia, J., & Cruz-González, C. (2022). Early career researchers' identity: A qualitative review. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 76(4), 786-799. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12348>

- Mulligan, A., Hall, L., & Raphael, E. (2013). Peer review in a changing world: An international study measuring the attitudes of researchers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64(1), 132-161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22798>
- National Science Board, National Science Foundation. (2023). Publications output: U.S. trends and international comparisons. *Science and Engineering Indicators 2024*. NSB-2023-33. NSF. <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb202333/>
- Niles, M. T., Schimanski, L. A., McKiernan, E. C., & Alperin, J. P. (2020). Why we publish where we do: Faculty publishing values and their relationship to review, promotion and tenure expectations. *Plos One*, 15(3), e0228914. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228914>
- OECD. (2023). *Artificial intelligence in science: Challenges, opportunities, and the future of research*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a8d820bd-en>
- Roberts, T. G., Harder, A., & Lindner, J. R. (2025). The Peer Review Process: Perspectives of Reviewers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 66(3), Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.v66i3.3201>
- Rowley, J., & Sbaffi, L. (2018). Academics' attitudes towards peer review in scholarly journals and the effect of role and discipline. *Journal of Information Science*, 44(5), 644-657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551517740821>
- Rowley, J., Sbaffi, L., Sugden, M., & Gilbert, A. (2020). Factors influencing researchers' journal selection decisions. *Journal of Information Science*, 48(3), 321-335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551520958591>
- Severin, A., & Chataway, J. (2021). Overburdening of peer reviewers: A multi-stakeholder perspective on causes and effects. *Learned Publishing*, 34(4), 537-546. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1392>
- Smith, O. M., Davis, K. L., Pizza, R. B., Waterman, R., Dobson, K. C., Foster, B., ... & Davis, C. L. (2023). Peer review perpetuates barriers for historically excluded groups. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 7(4), 512-523. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-023-01999-w>
- Solomon, D. J., & Björk, B. C. (2012). Publication fees in open access publishing: Sources of funding and factors influencing choice of journal. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(1), 98-107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21660>
- Sziklai, B. R. (2021). Ranking institutions within a discipline: The steep mountain of academic excellence. *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(2), 101133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101133>
- Tennant, J. P., & Ross-Hellauer, T. (2020). The limitations to our understanding of peer review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 5(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-020-00092-1>
- Teplitskiy, M., Acuna, D., Elamrani-Raoult, A., Körding, K., & Evans, J. (2018). The sociology of scientific validity: How professional networks shape judgment in peer review. *Research Policy*, 47(9), 1825-1841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.06.014>
- Vernon, M. M., Balas, E. A., & Momani, S. (2018). Are university rankings useful to improve research? A systematic review. *PloS one*, 13(3), e0193762. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193762>

Waltman, L., Kaltenbrunner, W., Pinfield, S., & Woods, H. B. (2023). How to improve scientific peer review: Four schools of thought. *Learned Publishing*, 36(3), 334-347. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1544>

Watling, C., Ginsburg, S., & Lingard, L. (2021). Don't be reviewer 2! Reflections on writing effective peer review comments. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 10(5), 299-303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-021-00670-z>

Wijewickrema, M., & Petras, V. (2017). Journal selection criteria in an open access environment: A comparison between the medicine and social sciences. *Learned Publishing*, 30(4), 289-300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1113>

Wolfram, D., Wang, P., Hembree, A., & Park, H. (2020). Open peer review: Promoting transparency in open science. *Scientometrics*, 125(2), 1033-1051. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03488-4>