

IGTI Turbo Expo Guidelines for the Judicious Selection of Reviewers

The manuscript review process for the IGTI Turbo Expo is at once both a review for presentation at the conference and also a review for the ASME Transactions (*Journal of Turbomachinery* and *Journal of Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power*). This is a unique “conference” review process that bears a higher degree of responsibility on the part of the reviewers. This means that session organizers must select the reviewers carefully. Session organizers are encouraged to check / verify their selection of reviewers with their Vanguard chairs, Point Contacts, or Technical Committee chair or vice-chair if they have any reservations whatsoever, or simply wish a confirmation of appropriateness prior to reviews being performed. The choice of reviewers should follow these guidelines:

1. Journal review requires three independent and qualified reviewers, no fewer.
2. A reviewer must be technically qualified for the subject matter of the manuscript. We rely on the session organizer to be discriminating in this matter, and on the reviewer to decline subjects on which he/she feels less than comfortable. “Qualified” is a subjective judgment, but generally this is gauged by the potential reviewer’s own research and/or design experience and expertise evidenced by peer recognition and/or publications. Peer recognition need not be at the international level, nor broadly based across community segments, but must be validated via established participants. It must also be recognized that younger engineers both desire and need to gain experience and knowledge through participation in the review process. In such cases, it may be prudent to obtain more than three independent reviewers, or to require a more qualified person to mentor the reviewer.
3. It is highly desirable that the three reviewers represent diverse technical community segments. Ideally there will be one reviewer from each segment – academia, government, and industry. As an example to the contrary, having three academic or three industrial reviewers may significantly skew the review results in the positive or negative direction. It is recognized however that some technical subjects do not have qualified reviewers in all community segments, and in fact may only be well represented by one segment. In such cases, the session organizer need only communicate this fact to the Review Chair in the final recommendation.
4. Reviewers must not represent the same industrial, academic, or government organization. The reasoning here is that reviewers from a common organization may tend to hold common opinions on the subject matter. There is some leeway in the interpretation of this guideline. For example, reviewers might be from differing divisions of the same large organization rather than working side-by-side.
5. Reviewers must not be from the same organization as the authors. Again, there is some leeway in the interpretation of this guideline. For example, reviewers might be from differing divisions of the same large organization. In this instance, it would be best to avoid any such potential conflict however. Per ASME policy, “A reviewer shall avoid conflicts of interest and/or the appearance thereof. If a manuscript submitted for review presents a potential conflict of interest or the reviewer has a personal bias, the reviewer shall return the manuscript promptly without review, and so advise the appropriate conference organizer.”
6. Reviewers should not be “related” to the authors. A good example of this is when the reviewer is a recent former student of the author, or vice versa. This is not always known *a priori*, and hence it is also the responsibility of the reviewer to speak up in such cases. Per ASME policy, “A reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom the reviewer has a personal or professional connection if the relationship would bias judgment of the manuscript.”
7. The session organizer should avoid becoming an official reviewer. This typically has happened when the scheduled review time is running short and reviewers are not readily obtained. The session organizer needs to remain independent in this process to evaluate the reviews, and if necessary to render a tie breaking recommendation to the Review Chair.

The best source of qualified reviewers is the ASME/IGTI Technical Committee that is concerned with the subject matter of the manuscript. It is suggested that Committee members be fully engaged and leveraged for the review process. It is not required that reviewers be Committee members or members of ASME however, as there are many highly qualified non-members to draw upon.

Information on the ethical obligations of authors, reviewers, and conference organizers may be found at www.asme.org/Publications/ConfProceedings/Author/Ethics.cfm.