

ISM 6109 Mock Article Review - Critique

Having read the actual reviews, I am now able to assess how my mock review compares to them. All of the reviewers (excepting reviewer #2's short contribution) and I were in general agreement on the aims and topic of the paper, although I believe reviewer #3's apparent bias led to a slightly different interpretation. The first two reviewers and I also agreed on the strengths of the paper—reviewer #1 in particular shared many of my opinions here—and the few positive comments reviewer #3 made also echoed my review. Reviewer #1 also noted—albeit not as directly—the issues I identified in the structure of the literature review. In addition, most of the reviewers (except #3) agreed with me that the paper should be revised and resubmitted, albeit with different degrees of suggested revision (#2 the least, then my review, then #1 the most).

In terms of overall structure my review and review #1 are similar, with an introduction, presentation of strengths, and discussion of weaknesses. Reviewer #1 did differ, however, in their inclusion of specific comments. I did not include such a list due both to lack of space and to feeling a laundry list of concerns was unnecessary. I felt raising the issues and problems I had found and pointing out a few examples of their occurrence—as I tried to do—would be easier for the authors to follow. Personally, I would rather have seen the most salient items from reviewer #1's list integrated into the body of their review. Both reviewer #1 and I did our best to keep to constructive comments, unlike reviewer #3 who took issue with a perceived lack of contributions and theoretical / methodological development. I would argue their apparent personal biases unfortunately tainted the review too much, and feel I did a better job of remaining constructive. Review #2 was a little too short to be of as much use as #1, #3, and mine, at least in my view.

The differences were most striking when looking at the focus of the reviews. Since I did not have great familiarity with the topic of the article beyond a broad overview of group support

systems (GSS) research—a fact I disclaimed in my review—I chose to focus primarily on the structure, style, flow, and grammar of the paper. While I certainly considered the theory, method, results, and other content while reading and reviewing, I was not well placed to decide whether they were entirely appropriate given my state of knowledge. This did help me, I feel, catch some issues with flow, style, and grammar that all three reviewers missed or deemed unimportant. Nevertheless, while having a different focus reviewer #1 in particular was clearly very knowledgeable about deception in GSS and thus made what were generally excellent comments about the definitions, assumptions, and theory present in the article. On most of these points I would certainly bow to the greater experience of this reviewer, having missed entirely many of these issues with the paper. I do see both sides of the open/closed system debate, however, and do not feel that issue was a big a problem for the paper as reviewer #1 did.

A few other comments from the reviewers point out areas I did note while reading the article, but that did not make it into my final review. Some examples include suggesting more discussion of limitations, echoed by reviewer #1; clarification of the figures, discussed by reviewer #2; and the relative lack of linkage between the theory and the four studies, stressed by reviewer #3 (although I feel less strongly here than the reviewer). Given more space and a real review situation, I may have gone ahead and included these comments as well.

Finally, the editors' decision was the same as mine: revise and resubmit. However, I did not mention or consider three of the four issues they suggested fixing in any way. I did note the fourth issue—adjusting the title, abstract, and introduction to focus “more on Gerry [DeSanctis]'s ideas than Gerry per se”—but felt it was less important than other issues I raised and did not have space for it. This is, again, indicative of the biggest difference with my review: a focus on style and structure rather than on content specifics I was not greatly familiar with.