

## OVERVIEW AND SCOPE

The **Journal of Distilling Science (JDS)** is both an online and in-print journal with an overarching reach for reviews and original research papers dealing with the science and technology disciplines involved in the production of potable distilled spirits and related alcoholic beverages. The journal will become an integral part of the Society of Distilling Scientists and Technologists (SDST — to be formed in 2021).

**Full instructions to authors are provided in a separate document.** This guide is primarily concerned with the Journal's manuscript reviewing system and providing guidance for the reviewer. **Reviewers should also see the JDS Ethical Publishing in the 21st Century guide.**

The lead science editor — currently Gary Spedding, Ph.D. — thanks each and everyone of you who have signed up for the very responsible role of reviewing manuscripts and providing your expert and considered opinion on the merits of the works supplied for publication in the JDS.

The advice supplied here will guide in the responsibilities of providing unbiased, though educated and informed opinions on the merits of work done by authors from around the world. This is one reason we have an Internationally recognized body of experts from around the globe to oversee manuscript submissions. Most countries have groups involved in potable distilled spirits research with much to offer the growing Distilling community and in raising the safety and quality levels of potable beverages.

While we do not expect our reviewers to translate or interpret for the journal, a team with members whose primary language is not English will offer our authors a benefit not found in many other Journal editorial/review groups.

We have seasoned reviewers aboard — those having served such a role before or whom are currently serving on other boards. Many of our reviewers also having an

established and solid record of publication. As a new Journal we also have those less familiar with the process. Many works dealing with ethical and quality publishing have appeared on line and in PDF downloadable documents. A quick presentation of such materials will help ease our newer reviewers into the process and/or provide some reminders or even fresh advice for our veterans.

All may benefit from the advice presented here — especially in view of the concerns of the scientific community of late in seeing a decline in the reputation of science. The decline based on poorer publishing practices, biases and fraudulent publication and the retraction of publications sometimes associated with even very famous names. The JDS must accept only the finest that our scientific and technically trained colleagues can supply. Journals today make use of “Similarity searches” to ensure the authenticity and freshness of the material. Such searches often performed by means of seeking out acts of plagiarism or to see if authors have published such material elsewhere, and are thus claiming multiple publication credit. Editorial review systems that have moved to totally electronic access platforms have also been hacked of late and fraudulent papers published. Financial and non-financial rewards being earned by those getting away with these behaviors. Author's appearing on the title roster not having made any contribution to the research or the review are regularly called out. The JDS will only accept manuscripts signed off by all authors', except in those rare circumstances when an author is no longer able to do so. The lead author or the team leader will then need to sign-off on any subsequent changes to the authorship. Authorship of publications currently the topic of debate within scientific circles (1-4).

## IS REVIEWING RIGHT FOR YOU?

We appreciate that the invitation to review for the JDS puts a lot of responsibility upon our collective team members. However, we thank you and believe your

*The Journal of Distilling Science (© Artisan Spirit Media) with all rights reserved has been accepted as the official publication of the Society of Distilling Scientists and Technologists (SDST) and is under the editorship of an independent review body appointed and staffed by the founding members of the SDST. It is devoted to the advancement and publication of basic and applied knowledge related primarily to the production of potable alcoholic beverages.*

responsible actions and dedicated care to the task at hand will raise the bar on the quality of distilling publications and the broadening of knowledge. Knowledge and actionable data that is quite clearly needed and in a more central location by the distilling community. Searching through perhaps the only journal in the world with distilling in its title and at its core mission to find much needed information will prove of enormous value for the industry as a whole. We indeed hope this important responsibility is right for you.

### THE REVIEW PROCESS AT JDS

---

The review process is to be a single blind model. Author's names will be understood by the reviewers but authors will not know who reviewed their manuscripts. All reviewer models are not without their issues and inherent biases. The single blind model seeing favor with pure science-based journals. See the references in the **JDS Ethical Publishing in the 21st Century guide**.

The JDS will field articles to three reviewers. Reviewers will receive a two-page Electronic Form as a PDF, along with the manuscript. The form will indicate reviewer #; 1, 2 or 3. These numbers fully meaningful only to the lead science editor. In certain cases this will relate to a hierarchical distribution based on the expertise of the reviewers chosen, or based on their indicated requested topic/subject areas for review. In other situations each reviewer will be on a level playing field. All reviewers' comments and decisions will be important to making the final rejection or publish decision.

The reviewer form is largely self-explanatory with radio buttons for the final decision (accept, with or without revision, or reject) and two sections for commentary and revision suggestions. One "Confidential" section will be seen only by the editor and the other, separated from the returned document, forwarded to the authors for them to make any necessary final changes prior to publication or for them to understand why their work has not met publication criteria.

The courtesy of a return of the completed reviewer form within three weeks of acceptance will greatly assist the speed to publication of all articles. Any reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in the manuscript forwarded to them, or

who knows it's prompt review will be impossible must notify the lead editor or editorial office immediately and excuse themselves from the review process. With all due respect to the confidential nature of the peer review process, the manuscript PDF or other files or documents should promptly be deleted or destroyed in such cases.

Certain journals allow author's to suggest reviewers and, assuming no bias, and ensuring confidentiality, that may be an occasionally entertained possibility. Likewise a member of our review board might suggest another person deemed suitable for the task. Decisions made to use alternates will only be known to the lead science editor, so no assumptions should be made as to employment of such persons suggested by author or fellow reviewers. For the coverage of papers from all countries, the reviewer body will grow with additional members suitably qualified as drawn from many countries across the globe.

In regards to all this, the lead science editor must also endeavor to avoid any biases and Gary Spedding (initial lead editor) hereby makes a promise to all authors, reviewers and team members of the Society of Distilling Scientists and Technologists (SDST), the JDS, and the publisher, and all others, that he will indeed do all in his power to avoid the biases and potential pitfalls at play in all such activities. Upon formation of the SDST and the full incorporation of the Journal into its jurisdiction the editorial committee to be formally approved will assume the greater role of governance over the editorial process.

### THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEWERS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

---

Authors will be asked to declare any conflicts of interest when they submit their manuscript. As reviewers will be asked to scrutinize otherwise confidential documents they too must eliminate bias and also declare if they see any conflict of interest whatsoever. The editorial review board members being potential authors of manuscripts for the journal must not unfairly criticize or reject work based on their or their research group pursuing similar interests. This being one critique against the single blind, as opposed to double or even triple blind reviewing. See the article on peer review — The Good,

the Bad, and the Ugly (5) and the review — Reform and Renewal in Scientific Publishing (6) on this matter.

Authors' are referred to the American Chemical Society's — The ACS Style Guide for a general discussion of the principles and practices of scientific publishing. The American Medical Association's AMA Manual of Style, and similar works, are also recommended. Moreover, those authors' whose primary language is not English are encouraged to seek out translation services whenever possible or needed. The JDS team not currently set up for such translation activities.

### THE FLOWCHARTS OF INFORMATION

To aid all authors and our reviewers across the globe we note the availability of flowcharts describing the publication principles and ethics involved in publication — including duplication of published materials, plagiarism, fabricated data, changes in authorship, ghost writing, the retraction of publications and biases issues. These guides, available in Chinese, Croatian, English, French, Italian, Japanese, Persian, Polish, Spanish and Turkish, are available from COPE ([publicationethics.org](http://publicationethics.org)). These charts will assist our reviewers to better understand all aspects of scientific publication and their duties as critical components in the process of publishing in the JDS and indeed elsewhere in the global scientific arena.

The Voice of Young Science (VoYS) research network discuss the ins and outs, advantages and limitations of the peer review process. A series of interviews with editors and reviewers providing a Q and A segment of interest (7). The VoYS publication also discussing the three main models of peer review in use today (7).

### WHAT REVIEWERS SHOULD DO TO AID IN THE ADVANCEMENT OF DISTILLING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE

Peer reviewers are essentially gatekeepers — they determine which papers should be accepted for publication and which thereby become an important part of the body of knowledge accepted by the field.

They may also influence, through suggested revisions, the overall appearance of the data and the overall picture portrayed to the world at large. In so doing they must not alter the data, or bias the story in any significant way that takes away the voice of the authors, unless it genuinely corrects errors, mistakes or misinterpretations which the authors must address and deal with in revision. The process must also avoid reviewer-based biased interpretation. It is also to be hoped that nothing is lost in the translation of voices in one language to that of the publication (English in this case). Peer reviewers of course have come to be accepted as the appropriately qualified and unbiased experts in their respective fields.

Reviewers should always keep in mind that they are assessing the work and not the author. Reviewers will summarize for the author what they believe the paper aimed to achieve and if they succeeded in that overall aim. A reviewer will highlight the major findings, strengths and significance of the manuscript and point out any deficiencies. Helping the author fully understand the larger significance of the work and potentially pointing out ways to express their ideas a little more clearly. Furthermore, reviewers will dissect the methods, results and discussion sections and try to ensure that all relevant background resources and references have been included within the arguments made in defense of the research. Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported, but missed by the authors, should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Reviewers must also call to the lead science editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under their consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge. Such manuscripts can be subject to similarity searches. An infographic: "Reviewer Evaluation Considerations" will be available to JDS reviewers covering concepts derived and adapted from Peer Review: Reform and Renewal (6); many points above and below expounded upon in that graphic.

Reviews should be honest, objective and free from personal prejudice. Personal criticism of the author(s) is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly and with supporting arguments.

### A SUMMARY AS TO CRITERIA TO LOOK FOR IN A MANUSCRIPT

---

Assessment benchmarks and their leading questions will often include (6):

#### ORIGINALITY

---

Is the data new, and are concepts novel in their nature?

#### VALIDITY

---

Are the results testable and reproducible?

#### CONTEXT

---

Do the authors seem to be aware of other similar work in the field? This will be seen through the introduction and cited references. [Editor: Today we are seeing more reinventions of the wheel with similar data and ideas having seen the light of day in decades old issues of journals. As big data collection catches up and more Journal archives are completely recorded this issue may diminish. It is also hoped that the three reviewer process will eliminate many cases of missed earlier works of a comparable nature to the one currently being reviewed.]

#### CLAIMS

---

Do the authors seem to overplay their hand with respect to their tone and conclusions in relation to their actual findings?

#### ACCURACY

---

Is the paper free of obvious errors? Are units, significant digits, algorithms and or statistical evaluations sound? Are references cited completely and correctly? Are there any ambiguous terms — especially important in understanding sensory descriptors. Different languages may have many terms for the sensory acuities and sensory attributes, or have only a few terms to describe the same things, and confusion can arise easily in this regard.

In reviewing experimental design and analysis protocols, a paper dealing with the mathematical and statistical rigor needed for publication in the British Journal of Pharmacology will be of use to authors

and reviewers of materials to be published elsewhere, including in the JDS (8).

Is the context for the data collection described in sufficient detail? Are any exclusion or inclusion criteria covered (for data, or subjects in sensory trials for example)? How was the data analyzed? Are variables and control strategies discussed? Where are the experimental errors? How are/were errors avoided, reduced or eliminated?

#### SYNTHESIS

---

If the article is a review of a specific topic or field of investigation, does it appear to be sound, comprehensive and balanced and, moreover, representative of a complete evaluation of the current literature. Does it appear to be unfairly weighted/biased towards the authors own findings or beliefs — or to others maybe exerting pressure on the authors? Articles in the JDS must not be overly commercial or advertorial in nature. [See **A note on Review Papers** below.]

#### LIMITATIONS

---

Do there appear to be limitations to the research or findings as presented and have the authors' comprehended this and addressed them? Could other experiments or additional information improve the science? Would the presentation be improved if extra work was to be recommended? What would that extra research work involve?

#### TECHNIQUES AND EVALUATION TOOLS

---

Were the appropriate methods, techniques, instrumentation, calculations and statistical tools applied and implemented correctly? Were the right controls and number of replicates etc. used. [See also under **Accuracy** above.]

#### ETHICAL ISSUES

---

Was everything done to and within accepted ethical standards and protocols? Are there any apparent conflicts of interest?

### IMPLICATIONS

Does the work advance our understanding of the field? In what way is it contributing to our knowledge and how applicable are its findings to the industry at large? Are the findings of a positive or a negative nature? Do they confirm or refute previous findings and concepts?

**As an aside.** Scientific publications have been accused of failing to report findings of a negative nature. This topic would form a lengthy treatise in its own right. Experiments and research that genuinely and soundly conclude that systems do not work can be as valid as those that are workable concepts. While science must always be able to attempt to prove published results the presentation of negative findings can save others pursuing the same “dead end” leads.

### A NOTE ON REVIEW PAPERS

Review papers can form important contributions to the scientific literature but have been regarded sometimes as a quick way to publication, benefiting both author and publisher. The JDS will feature reviews, both invited and unsolicited — the call for papers covering original research topics, reviews and other types of technical reports. All materials will be peer-reviewed.

The hallmarks of a good review according to one author (8) seem relevant here. “There are two classes of useful reviews: (i) comprehensive and well-ordered literature surveys and (ii) (even better) surveys providing, in addition, novel aspects and views resulting from the synopsis of the original papers within a field.” (8) Authors and reviewers should both ensure that the JDS publishes only first class reviews in furtherance of the dissemination of world class quality knowledge applicable to the mission of the creation and appreciation of distilled spirits and related alcoholic beverages.

### EXAMPLES OF LITERATURE CITATION/REFERENCE STYLE

[1] Von Bergen, C.W.; Bressler, M.S. Volume 32. Academe’s unspoken ethical dilemma: author inflation in higher education. *The Research in Higher Education*

Journal. 32, 1-17. (No date provided.) <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1148909.pdf>

[2] Tilak, G.; Prasad, V.; Jena, A. B. Authorship Inflation in Medical Publications Inquiry. **2015**, Jan-Dec; 52: 0046958015598311. Published online **2015** Jul 29. doi:10.1177/0046958015598311 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4943864/>

[3] Is there an inflation in the number of authors per paper? <https://academia.stackexchange.com/questions/16759/is-there-an-inflation-in-the-number-of-authors-per-paper>

[4] Wren, J.D.; Kozak, K.Z.; Johnson, K.R.; Deakyne, S.J.; Schilling, L.M.; Dellavalle, R.P. The write position. A survey of perceived contributions to papers based on byline position and number of authors. *EMBO Reports*. **2007**, 8, 988-991 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2247376/pdf/7401095.pdf>

[5] Research Solutions Marketing Team. Peer Review: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. **2019**. <https://www.researchsolutions.com/blog/peer-review-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly>

[6] Etkin, A.; Gaston, T.; Roberts, J. Peer Review: Reform and Renewal in Scientific Publishing. Charleston Briefings. Against the Grain (Media), LLC. **2017**. doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9944026. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cb/mpub9944026/--peer-review-reform-and-renewal-in-scientific-publishing?view=toc>

[7] Standing up for Science 3. Peer Review: The nuts and bolts. A guide for early career researchers. **2012**. Voice of Young Science. <https://senseaboutscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/peer-review-the-nuts-and-bolts.pdf>

[8] Curtis, M.J.; Alexander, S.; Cirino, G.; Docherty, J.A.; George, C.H.; Giembycz, M.A.; et al. Experimental Design and Analysis and Their Reporting II: Updated and Simplified Guidance for Authors and Peer Reviewers. *British Journal of Pharmacology*. **2018**. 175, 987-993. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323665515\\_Experimental\\_design\\_and\\_analysis\\_and\\_their\\_reporting\\_II\\_updated\\_and\\_simplified\\_guidance\\_for\\_authors\\_and\\_peer\\_reviewers\\_Editorial](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323665515_Experimental_design_and_analysis_and_their_reporting_II_updated_and_simplified_guidance_for_authors_and_peer_reviewers_Editorial)

[9] Schubert, I. We Have an Inflation of Review Papers-for What Are Reviews Good? *Frontiers in Plant Science*. **2016**. 7, Article 88. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2016.00088. [https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/722c/d408f9f9ee9c3440d3e3e1668efcb6698d05.pdf?\\_a=2.159432381.1233659581.1612141289-904542928.1612141289](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/722c/d408f9f9ee9c3440d3e3e1668efcb6698d05.pdf?_a=2.159432381.1233659581.1612141289-904542928.1612141289)

*[All links last accessed 2-04-2021.]*

In formulating the policies and directives for publishing in the JDS, the above quoted references have proven useful guides to the current scientific publishing scene. The rules set forth by the Publisher and the Editor not limited to the advice derived therefrom. With all rights reserved, policies, activities and actions may change over time but will always be implemented to ensure the best possible practices of fair, truthful and unbiased publishing.

As in all matters of concern, or where further advice is needed, the lead science editor stands ready to assist.

[gspedding@jdsed.com](mailto:gspedding@jdsed.com)

*Terms and conditions and formatting guidelines may change from time to time, so please ensure you are reading the latest versions of the JDS guides for publishing within its pages and on-line. JDS Online*

*Other materials, infographics and guides are available in relation to publishing in the Journal of Distilling Science.*