



**Universiteit
Leiden**
The Netherlands

The value of reviewer diversity and inclusivity

Jong, P.G.M. de; Smith, P.J.W.

Citation

Jong, P. G. M. de, & Smith, P. J. W. (2021). The value of reviewer diversity and inclusivity. *Clinical Teacher*, 19(1), 65-65. doi:10.1111/tct.13442

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3638903>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

The value of reviewer diversity and inclusivity

In the October 2021 issue of *The Clinical Teacher*, Yip and Rashid¹ highlighted the risk of editorial bias caused by a lack of diversity and representation in editorial board composition. While many editors will shake their heads in denial, one is reminded that we are far more able to see the act of bias in others than in ourselves.² We therefore thank Yip and Rashid for their examination of editorial board composition as a reminder for us all.

However, we wonder if diversity, inclusivity and equity in journal reviewers might be of even more importance than the diversity of editorial boards. Journal reviewers are crucial in the review process, and they are the first to examine submitted manuscripts in detail. In our journal *Medical Science Educator*, the reviewers currently outnumber the editorial board members by almost 30:1. For every manuscript received, the decision of an editor is influenced by these reviewers.

It is incumbent upon editorial boards of international journals to promote global perspectives in the articles they choose to publish, which in turn reflect their readerships. Diversifying reviewer pools by including academics from different gender, geographical region, country income level, native language, race and ethnicity will help to address unconscious, but nonetheless persistent, editorial bias. *Cell* has explicitly set out its mission to improve the diversity of its reviewer pool through outreach involving authors themselves.³ Such approaches are even more commendable to improve the inclusiveness of medical education publishing than focussing only on editorial board composition.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS


This article was written on behalf of the entire Editorial Board of *Medical Science Educator*.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

ETHICS STATEMENT

This article does not require ethics approval.

Peter G. M. de Jong¹ 

Paula J. W. Smith² 

the Editorial Board of *Medical Science Educator*

¹Center for Innovation in Medical Education, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, Netherlands

²Deanery of Clinical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Correspondence

Paula J.W. Smith, Deanery of Clinical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.
Email: paula.smith@ed.ac.uk

ORCID

Peter G. M. de Jong  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9038-3137>

Paula J. W. Smith  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3878-427X>

REFERENCES

1. Yip SW, Rashid MA. Editorial diversity in medical education journals. *Clin Teach*. 2021;18:523–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tct.13386>
2. Pronin E, Lin DY, Ross L. The bias blind spot: Perceptions of bias in self versus others. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 2002;28(3):369–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202286008>
3. The Cell Editorial Team. Building and supporting identity in peer review. *Cell*. 2021;184(20):P5071–2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2021.09.017>