

**Bowling Green State University**

---

**From the Selected Works of Louisa Ha**

---

Spring March 1, 2016

# Why Reviewing Manuscripts for JMCQ and Posting Full Research Materials Online Are Smart Things to Do

Louisa Ha



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/louisa\\_ha/37/](https://works.bepress.com/louisa_ha/37/)

# Why Reviewing Manuscripts for JMCQ and Posting Full Research Materials Online Are Smart Things to Do

Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly  
2016, Vol. 93(1) 5–15  
© 2016 AEJMC  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1077699016630320  
jmcq.sagepub.com



More and more refereed scholarly journals in the science and social science fields today require that research protocols and other supplementary research materials of the articles they publish are uploaded online. Such materials can be the complete list of article titles used in a bibliometric study, the experiment stimuli in an experiment, the coding scheme in a content analysis, and the survey questionnaire in a survey or even data sets. This is to ensure full transparency of the research they publish to allow for replication and checking. In our summer editorial board meeting at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) conference, the attending board members agreed that this can be a good practice; one that can encourage research replication, use of the coding scheme or scales. However, to avoid too much burden on the authors, we made it an opt-in process on a trial basis and will not require data posting. Effective October 1, 2015, we informed authors of our accepted manuscripts that they have the option of providing research materials as supplementary information, by posting them online alongside the research article. They would continue to have the copyright on those materials. We then posted two of our OnlineFirst articles with these supplementary materials: (a) *Mapping the Social Capital Research in Communication: A Bibliometric Analysis* by Chul-joo Lee and Dongyoung Sohn and (b) *Are Newspapers' Online Discussion Boards Democratic Tools or Conspiracy Theories' Engines? A Case Study on an Eastern European "Media War"* by Vera Slavtcheva-Petkova. Readers need to go to the online version to retrieve the supplementary materials.

I would love to hear feedback from our readers on the full research material posting practice, and encourage authors of accepted manuscripts to post their materials. Without the print constraint of space, I hope this will provide readers interested in a topic a more complete experience in consuming the research produced by the authors, facilitate students and junior scholars to learn how to prepare research materials, and promote more follow-up studies.

The increase in new submissions to *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* (JMCQ) has almost doubled in the past year. Hence, the Publications Committee and AEJMC board approved the inclusion of a fifth associate editor. Sei-Hill Kim of University of South Carolina joined our editorial team to help handle the influx of manuscripts.

As we begin 2016, on behalf of our entire editorial team, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to our hard-working reviewers who generously volunteered their time and shared their insights and advice in their reviews to the authors last year. A total of 519 ad hoc reviewers completed reviews for us, in addition to our 80 board members. The list of reviewers and the number of manuscripts they reviewed for us are listed at the end of this essay. As more and more universities would like evidence of the review service for merit and other purposes, I encourage our reviewers to track their review record with dates in the Reviewer Center of the Manuscript Central/Sage Track system.

Last year, I sent the individualized commendation letters to the supervisors of our 28 outstanding ad hoc reviewers who completed at least two reviews (including reviewing for a revised manuscript), accepted all of our invitations with a perfect score on timeliness in submitting their reviews and review quality. I was very touched when I received this note from Michael Bugeja, Director of the Greenlee School of Journalism and Communication of Iowa State University:

Thank you for your gracious letter about Gang Han's professional academic service to *JMCQ*. As you can see below, we have shared your kind words with the faculty, staff and Advisory Council. Please know how much we appreciate a busy editor and scholar such as yourself taking time out to commend exemplary service. Dr. Han is one of our top scholars, and we all appreciate his relationship with our flagship journal.

There are other supervisors who also acknowledged the commendation letters. I hope on-time and high-quality reviews will receive recognition in the merit review process on a regular basis, especially for full professors who no longer go through the tenure and promotion process. Also, some authors wrote back to us to show their appreciation of how much the reviews helped them even though their manuscripts were rejected. These responses show the payoff of high-quality reviews. In a nutshell, we need more appreciation of timely and high-quality review service.

## **Why Review for *JMCQ*?**

As the Committee of Publication Ethics stated, reviewing is a privilege. Yet, some scholars view manuscript reviewing as a chore that takes away their time to do research, as we see an increase in the number of declines of our invitations. After our editorial team does the initial screening, the manuscripts that are sent out to reviewers then rely on these expert reviewers to help refine the submitted manuscript, and provide detailed feedback to authors and publication recommendation to the editor. We understand that qualified reviewers are in high demand. Yet, there are also other very busy and highly productive and prominent scholars who have heavy commitments as editors of other journals, or department chairs, who are still committed to reviewing for our journal with timely and high-quality reviews. I asked some of them for their time management, review strategies and tips, and reasons for their commitment to our journal as reference for our readers, who may be invited as reviewers or consuming the reviews that our reviewers wrote.

**Claes de Vreese**, professor, University of Amsterdam; editor, *Political Communication*:

I enjoy reviewing for *JMCQ* because most of the submitted manuscripts have my direct interest. I consider reviewing an honor and an obligation. The entire peer review system stands and falls with all of us chipping in in that process, so I prioritize reviewing in a busy schedule. If manuscripts are clearly below the bar I will offer a few big observations on why that is the case. This allows me to provide more detailed feedback in those cases where R&R seem likely.

*JMCQ* gets a good mix of manuscripts, many of them very close to my own research and interests. Saying no to review requests should be an exception rather than the rule. Again, the system stands (and falls!) with reciprocity. If you are pressed for time you can also occasionally contact the editor and ask if a brief overall assessment is sufficient as an exception. Oftentimes editors will still appreciate a candid assessment and they might obtain one more assessment before making the call, but this is still better than saying no to reviewing.

**Lance Holbert**, professor and department chair, Temple University; and associate editor of *Journal of Communication* (2013-2015):

It is never easy to find time for a range of tasks performed in academe, but you make time for the activities that are most important. For me, reviewing works for possible publication is one of the most important acts we undertake as scholars. Personally, I tend to complete reviews when I am between research projects. Once I complete a manuscript, I like to clear my head before turning to the next paper. Completing a few reviews allows me to wipe the slate clean between my own projects. In terms of completing reviews relative to my administrative duties, I am not ashamed to admit that there are times when I am proactively looking for excuses not to attend to various administrative affairs and a journal review can supply a welcome excuse. As a result, there are moments when I am quite grateful to be crafting a journal review.

Completing journal reviews allows me to remain current with the literature and to gain a better sense of the pulse of the field—what topics are being engaged, what methods are being employed, what new analytical strategies are being undertaken. The primary audience for a peer-review journal article is other experts in the field. I see it as a privilege to play a role in making decisions on the content other experts are going to come into contact with and to help make that content as strong as possible with a goal to move the field forward. Also, if I submit a work for review, then it is my responsibility to answer the call to review. If I submit a paper to a journal for publication review, then I treat it as an obligation that I should agree to perform no less than three reviews for that journal. We typically receive three reviews for our submissions. As a result, I should be willing to give back to the journal what I take in terms of human resources. Otherwise, I am nothing more than a free rider. In terms of performing reviews in your area of expertise, what would keep me from wanting to help shape the research area I feel most passionate about? If I have generated a sufficient reputation for your research acumen to be asked to perform a review, then that expertise should be shared with the field through service to the journal. As for editorial board

members performing reviews, they should agree to review when asked. Only under the rarest of circumstances should an editorial board member decline to review a work. A journal is not well served when someone of high stature is simply listed as an editorial board member. A journal is well served when that same editorial board member of high stature engages in the act of performing journal reviews.

**Patricia Moy**, associate vice provost for Academic and Student Affairs, Christy Cressey Professor of Communication, University of Washington; editor, *Public Opinion Quarterly*; editor-in-chief, *Oxford Bibliographies in Communication*; president, World Association for Public Opinion Research:

I see reviewing as part and parcel of academic citizenship. Without reviewers, a discipline simply would not advance in the same fashion. Reviewers are entrusted with contributing to the intellectual stewardship of a journal. They get to read the latest research that's being conducted; they get to shape an area of research; and if the study is viable, they get to help create from behind the scenes an even crisper manuscript.

There's also a social-contract aspect to reviewing. As an author, you benefit from the feedback reviewers provide. So when you receive an invitation to review, why not pay it forward? A very distinguished colleague at another institution once told me he says yes to practically all requests (reviews, committee work, etc.). Why? As an administrator, he knows how difficult it is to get people to agree to help out. So he helps whenever he can.

I actually don't differentiate between reviewing for *JMCQ* and other journals. Rather, with limited time, my key criterion is whether the research I'm invited to review falls directly within my areas of expertise. Fortunately, the invitations from EB journals (journals on whose editorial board I sit, including *JMCQ*) are pretty much on target in terms of intellectual fit.

Time is continual and perhaps the scarcest resource around. Fortunately, the cadence of academia allows for some—just some—predictability and control over our schedules. Reviewing manuscripts is something that many manage quite effectively in fits and starts—read in one sitting, write in another.

From an editor's perspective, it's always disappointing to see review invitations declined. But you realize early on people use different algorithms to determine when to accept or decline an invitation. I do appreciate it, however, when those who decline provide the names of others to consider inviting.

**Shyam Sundar**, distinguished professor and co-director, Media Effects Research Laboratory, Pennsylvania State University; editor, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*:

I still review manuscripts for *JMCQ* and other journals (despite being editor-in-chief of a high-volume journal) because I think it is an essential part of being an academic, just like

teaching and research. All of us who are active researchers in the field have a collective responsibility in ensuring that the research that gets published in our journals represent the best that our field has to offer at any given time. This means keeping up with extant literature and using state-of-the-art research techniques. I think the best reviewers are those who are actively conducting research themselves. They can recognize which is current and innovative.

I make time to review for journals, as part of my service and outreach activities, which is as important as research and teaching at my University. I juggle this along with other responsibilities by doing it in bits and pieces rather than hoping for an extended chunk of time for reading the whole manuscript and writing the review. I read manuscripts while exercising in the gym, during breaks in class, between meetings. I find that I am reading manuscripts all the time! Some of them take me several days to finish, just like a book.

*JMCQ* is one of the first journals I published in as a junior scholar. Reviewing for *JMCQ* gives me an opportunity to help the next generation of scholars in the field. The journal receives manuscripts from a fair number of junior scholars, so I find myself playing a mentoring role, which is intrinsically rewarding to me as a professor.

My advice to other scholars who see reviewing as a chore is three-fold: (1) View this as an opportunity to keep up with the field. When you were a graduate student, you read journal articles every week in response to course requirements. That kept you informed about the field. Once you became a faculty member, you were no longer required to read journal articles on a regular basis, so you read only those that pertain to your narrow research interests. Reviewing manuscripts for flagship journals like *JMCQ* can be seen as a self-imposed reading schedule that will help keep you abreast of the larger trends in the field; (2) The best scholarship is one where teaching, research and service are fully integrated. (3) Keep in mind that the reviews you receive for the manuscripts you submit are from your peers who have volunteered to help the journal in reaching a decision. Don't you think the decent thing to do is return the favor by reading their manuscript and providing honest feedback?

**Denis Wu**, professor, Boston University; associate editor, *Mass Communication and Society*:

Peer review is one of the quintessential components for any research community to sustain and flourish. It virtually is a must activity for any conscientious scholar to participate in for the common good of research community. The manuscripts I review for *JMCQ* are specifically related to the areas I conduct research in; whereas the manuscripts I process for another journal (MC&S) fall into the fields I may be only familiar with. The tasks and functions for the two roles differ somewhat. Therefore, I am still willing to serve for the flagship journal of AEJMC when my schedule still allows. One of the benefits from reviewing *JMCQ* manuscripts is for me to carefully read the newest findings and/or to get updated with the cutting-edge methods that I might not have known. Thus reviewing can become a great learning process and keep scholars up-to-date.

## Highlights of Research Articles

In this spring issue, we featured an invited blind-refereed review essay on the problems and prospects of survey research by Patricia Moy and Joe Murphy. With the rapid changes in technology and the overall unfavorable environment toward survey research with declining response rates, this essay outlines some important guidelines and discusses the latest state-of-the-art practices for researchers who conduct survey research or experiments using self-reported responses in today's social and mobile media age.

One crucial concept in this digital age is interactivity. However, how interactivity and provision of personal information affect credibility in social media—especially for journalists—is unknown. Jahng and Littau's experiment, based on social-information-processing theory and social presence theory, shows that social cues (personal information of the journalists) and interactivity in response to audiences can increase journalists' credibility on Twitter. In the online environment, many news stories are anonymous with no clear sources. How can credibility then be determined? Appelman and Sundar's experiment develops and validates a pure message credibility scale without source for online news stories. It shows readers determine message credibility by how accurate, authentic, believable they perceive the message.

Turning to issues of world politics, the Arab Spring is a series of major political events that captured many scholars' and journalists' attention. We featured a pair of articles showing how foreign countries report the events using different lens. Du's article uses a quantitative framing approach to illustrate how news media in three Chinese media markets—Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, report Internet censorship in the Arab countries during the events; while Guzman's article uses a critical discourse analysis approach to show the evolution of frames on the Egyptian Revolution by the liberal CNN and conservative Fox News in the United States.

MacNamara's in-depth interviews with journalists and public relation practitioners in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States show their increasing interdependency and love-hate relationship with the rise of new sponsored journalism formats.

We have another pair of articles on professional journalists' job satisfaction in other parts of the world. Scherr and Baugut's study shows how German journalists' political leaning affects journalists' job satisfaction: Liberal journalists are more likely than conservative journalists to take an active role but they are more dissatisfied with their institutions' editorial policy and their audience. Ireri's national study of a representative sample of Kenyan journalists in different media reported high job satisfaction despite low income. These studies shed light on the variety of factors influencing job satisfaction in different country contexts.

Sevenans and Vliegthart's longitudinal study measuring media coverage and parliamentary questions in Belgium and The Netherlands shows how conflict framing influences political agendas. Last, but definitely not least, is a highly interesting historical study on the U.S. government's censorship of Japanese-Language Newspapers

in Japanese American Camps during World War II, showing the double standard of press freedom when it comes to a country’s own citizens versus the perceived “enemy.”

Happy reading!

Louisa Ha

*Editor*

*Professor, Bowling Green State University*

**Acknowledgment Of 2015 Ad Hoc Reviewers**

---

Abril, Eulalia (1)	Bode, Leticia (2)	Cassidy, Bill (2)
Ahmed, Saifuddin (1)	Boehmer, Jan (4)	Cha, Jiyoung (1)
Ahn, Hongmin (1)	Bolls, Paul (2)	Chan, Michael (2)
Aldoory, Linda (1)	Bonini, Tiziano (1)	Chang, Yu-li (2)
Alhabash, Saleem (1)	Boomgaarden, Hajo (3)	Chan-Olmsted, Sylvia (1)
Alt, Dorit (1)	Bowe, Brian J. (2)	Chao, Joy (1)
Amazeen, Michelle (3)	Bowen, Candace (1)	Chen, Regina (1)
Appiah, Osei (1)	Bowman, Nicholas (1)	Cheng, Benjamin (1)
Arceneaux, Noah (3)	Boyd-Barrett, Oliver (1)	Chernov, Gennadiy (1)
Arendt, Florian (1)	Boyle, Kris (2)	Cho, Jaeho (3)
Armstrong, Cory (1)	Boynton, Lois (1)	Choi, Grace (2)
Arrojo, Maria Jose (1)	Brader, Ted (1)	Choi, Jihyang (3)
Aubrey, Jennifer (1)	Brechman, Jean (1)	Chung, Chung Joo (1)
Avery, Elizabeth (1)	Brennen, Bonnie (1)	Chung, Deborah (1)
Azran, Tal (1)	Brewer, Paul (1)	Claeys, An-Sofie (1)
Bae, Jiyang (1)	Brislin, Tom (1)	Clark, Andrew (2)
Banning, Stephen (1)	Brogdon, Aaron (1)	Claussen, Dane (1)
Barnidge, Matthew (1)	Brosius, Hans-Bernd (1)	Clemens, Christopher (1)
Barthel, Michael (1)	Brown, Kenon (1)	Cocking, Ben (1)
Basil, Michael (2)	Brownlee, Bonnie (1)	Coddington, Mark (2)
Basu, Surhita (1)	Burkey, Brant (1)	Coffey, Amy Jo (1)
Beam, Michael (3)	Burns, Kelli (1)	Collins, Ross (1)
Belair-Gagnon, Valerie (2)	Cacciatore, Mike (1)	Connolly-Ahern, Colleen (1)
Benjamin, Louise (2)	Callahan, Clark (3)	Coronel, Jason (1)
Bergstrom, Kelly (1)	Callison, Coy (1)	Coward, John (1)
Billings, Andrew (3)	Calvert, Clay (2)	Cramer, Benjamin (1)
Bird, S. Elizabeth (1)	Camaj, Lindita (2)	Creech, Brian (2)
Bivins, Tom (1)	Carpenter, Serena (4)	Cressman, Dale (1)
Blake, Matthew (3)	Carragee, Kevin (1)	Cuillier, David (3)
Blasiola, Stacy (2)	Carroll, Brian (1)	Culver, Kathleen (1)
Blevens, Fred (5)	Carroll, Craig (1)	Cummins, Glenn (3)
Bobkowski, Piotr (1)	Carter, Shirley (2)	Dahmen, Nicole (1)
Bock, Mary (1)	Cassara, Catherine (1)	DAngelo, Paul (2)

---

*(continued)*



*(continued)*


---

Dardis, Frank (3)	Fu, Hanlong (2)	Holley, Jason (1)
Darling-Wolf, Fabienne (1)	Fu, King Wa (2)	Hollifield, Anne (3)
Davidson, Sanndra (1)	Funk, Marcus (1)	Holmes, Michael (1)
Davie, William (1)	Fursich, Elfriede(1)	Holody, Kyle (3)
Davis, Aeron (1)	Gade, Peter (7)	Holton, Avery (4)
Davis, Dennis (1)	Gadekar, Rahul (2)	Hon, Linda (1)
de Uriarte , Mercedes (2)	Ganahl, Richard (1)	Hong, Traci (2)
Deephouse, David (4)	Gearhart, Sherice (2)	Hopkins, Wat (1)
Delorme, Nicolas (1)	Ghanem, Salma (1)	Hossain, Mohammad (1)
Di Cicco, Damon (2)	Gibson, Rhonda (1)	Huang, Yi-Hui (1)
Dibari, Michael (1)	Gil de Zúñiga, Homero (2)	Hyun, Ki Deuk (3)
Diddi, Arvind (3)	Ginosar, Avshalom (2)	Incollingo, Jacqueline(1)
Diehl, Trevor (1)	Godler, Yigal (1)	Ireri, Kioko (1)
Dimitrova, Daniela (1)	Goh, Debbie(1)	Irwansyah, Irwansyah(1)
Dixon, Travis (1)	Gordillo, María del Mar(1)	Jackob, Nikolaus (1)
Dong, Qingwen (2)	Gray, Michael(1)	Jackson, David (1)
Du, Ying (2)	Greenwood, Keith(1)	Jayakar, Krishna (3)
Duffy, Andrew (1)	Greer, Jennifer (2)	Jeffres, Leo (2)
Dunsmore, Katherine (2)	Gross, Peter(2)	Jensen, Jakob (1)
Durham, Frank (1)	Grunig, James E. (4)	Jeong, Se-Hoon (1)
Dvorak, Jack (1)	Guo, Lei(1)	Jia, Haiyan (1)
Edgerly, Stephanie (1)	Gustafson, Kristin(1)	Jin, Yan (3)
Edmondson, Aimee (1)	Guth, Kristen (1)	Johnson, Benjamin K. (2)
Edy, Jill (1)	Haigh, Michel (3)	Johnson, Kirsten (1)
Ekdale, Brian (1)	Hakanen, Ernest (1)	Ju, Hyejung (1)
El-Bendary, Mohamed (1)	Hall, Alice (4)	Ju, Youngkee (4)
Ellithorpe, Morgan (2)	Hall, Calvin (1)	Jung, Jaemin (5)
Elmasry, Mohamad (1)	Hallman, William(1)	Kampf, Zohar(1)
Emmons, Betsy (2)	Halstuk, Martin(1)	Karlsson, Michael (1)
Engelmann, Ines (2)	Ham, Chang Dae (1)	Kaufhold, Kelly (1)
Engstrom, Erika (1)	Han, Gang (1)	Keith, Susan (1)
Everbach, Tracy (1)	Harper, Tael (1)	Kelly, Jim (1)
Ewoldsen, David (1)	Hart, Roderick (1)	Kenski, Kate(1)
Fargo, Anthony (1)	Hartzog, Woodrow (1)	Kent, Michael(1)
Faulker, Sandra (1)	Harwood, Jake(1)	Kent, Mike (1)
Feng, Guangchao (2)	Heim, Kyle (2)	Kern, Rebecca(1)
Ferguson, Douglas (1)	Hellmueller, lea (2)	Kerr, Robert(1)
Fernandes, Juliana (1)	Henderson, Jennifer (1)	Khang, Hyoungkoo (2)
Fico, Frederick G. (3)	Himmelboim, Itai (1)	Kim, Eunice (2)
Fogarty, Brian (1)	Hindman, Douglas (1)	Kim, Hyunjung (1)
Forde, Kathy Roberts (1)	Hmielowski, Jay (1)	Kim, Ji Won (1)
Formentin, Melanie (3)	Ho, Shirley (1)	Kim, Ji Young (2)
Franiuk, Renae (2)	Hoeken, Hans (1)	Kim, Jooyoung (1)
Freelon, Deen (1)	Hoewe, Jennifer (6)	Kim, Kyongseok (2)
Friedman, Barbara G. (1)	Hollander, Barry (4)	Kim, Yonghwan (1)

---

*(continued)*

(continued)

---

Kim, Yung Soo(1)	Littau, Jeremy (1)	Mukherjee Das, Mou (1)
Klein, Adam(1)	Lo, Ven-Hwei(2)	Murphy, Sharon(1)
Kleinnijenhuis, Jan(1)	Loew, Patty (1)	Murray, Michael (2)
Klin, A(1)	Logan, Kelty (2)	Myrick, Jessica (3)
Knobloch-Westerwick, Silvia (3)	Lou, Shanshan (1)	Nah, Seungahn(1)
Kodrich, Kris(1)	Luther, Catherine (1)	Napoli, Philip (1)
Kononova, Anastasia (3)	Maciejewsk, Jeffrey (1)	Nec, Rebecca (2)
Kowal, Christopher (1)	Mackay, Jenn (1)	Nekmat, Elmie (1)
Kozlowski, Dan (2)	MacLennan, Anne (1)	Neuberger, Christoph(1)
Kperogi, Farooq (4)	Macnamara, Jim (4)	Neuendorf, Kim(1)
Kruikemeier, Sanne (1)	Mahadeen, Ebtihal (1)	Newell, Jay (2)
Ksiazek, Thomas (1)	Maier, Scott (6)	Newton, Greg (1)
Kumar, Deepa (1)	Major, Ann (1)	Ngondo, Prisca(1)
Kurpius, David (2)	Maksl, Adam (2)	Nivas, Prem(1)
Kwak, Nojin (1)	Martin, Jason(5)	Oeldorf-Hirsch, Anne(1)
Kwoka, Margaret (1)	Masket, Seth (1)	Oh, Sang-Hwa(1)
Lagoe, Carolyn (1)	Massey, Brian (2)	Otmazgin, Nissim(1)
LaMarre, Heather (2)	Masullo Chen, Gina (2)	Pan, Zhongdang(1)
Lamme, Margot (Meg) (1)	Matthews, Julian (1)	Panek, Elliot(1)
Landreville, Kristen (3)	Maurantonio, Nicole (1)	Park, Chang Sup(1)
LaRose, Bob (3)	Maurer, Marcus(1)	Park, Hyojung(1)
Laucella, Pamela (1)	Mazzocco, Phil (1)	Park, Sung-Yeon (2)
Lazard, Allison (1)	McCutcheon, Jessica(1)	Parmele, John(3)
Lecheler, Sophie (1)	McGregor, Susan(2)	Parsons, Patrick (3)
Lee, Alice (2)	McKeever, Robert (2)	Pasadeos, Yorgo (2)
Lee, Angela (2)	McLemore, Dylan(1)	Pavolik, Brittany (1)
Lee, Chul-Joo (2)	McManus, John(1)	Peng, Zengjun (2)
Lee, Francis(1)	Medina, Mercedes(1)	Phillips, James(1)
Lee, Hyunmin(1)	Meeks, Lindsey (3)	Phillips, Laurie(1)
Lee, Jae(1)	Meirick, Patrick(4)	Picard, Robert (4)
Lee, Jayeon(1)	Melkote, Srinivas (1)	Pingree, Ray (1)
Lee, Laurie (2)	Mendelson, Andrew (2)	Pinkleton, Bruce (2)
Lee, Soobum (1)	Meraz, Sharon(1)	Plaisance, Patrick (3)
Lee, Tien-Tsung (4)	Metykova, Monika(1)	Pollock, John (3)
Leeper, Thomas (1)	Meyers, Cynthia(1)	Pompper, Donnalyn (1)
Len-Rios, Maria (2)	Miglani Vadhera, Neha(1)	Popp, Richard (2)
Lester, Paul (1)	Miller, Andrea (2)	Potter, W. James (1)
Lewis, Norman (2)	Mishra, Harsh (1)	Powell, Kimberly (1)
Li, Cong (3)	Moon, Bitt (3)	Pratt, Cornelius (3)
Li, Hairong (1)	Morin, David (2)	Prior, Markus(1)
Li, Xiaojin(1)	Morse, Matthew (1)	Pritchard, Andrew(1)
Li, Xigen(1)	Mortensen, Mette (1)	Rada, James (1)
Li, You(2)	Mothes, Cornelia (1)	Ragas, Matthew(2)
Liang, Yuhua (1)	Mou, Yi (4)	Raney, Arthur(1)
Lipschultz, Jeremy (6)	Muddiman, Ashley (1)	Reavy, Matthew(1)

---

(continued)

*(continued)*


---

Reid, Scot(1)	Sotirovic, Mira(1)	Vraga, Emily(1)
Reinardy, Scott(1)	Spratt, Meg (2)	Vukanovic, Zvezdan (1)
Rhee, Eun Soo (1)	St. John III, Burton (2)	Wagner, Michael (4)
Ribeiro, Nelson(1)	Stempel, Guido (5)	Wahl-Jorgensen, Karin (2)
Rideout, Travis (2)	Sternadori, Miglena(1)	Walsh, Kimberly(1)
Rim, Hyejoon(1)	Stewart, Daxton (3)	Walsh-Childers, Kim(1)
Rodgers, Shelly(1)	Sturgill, Amanda(1)	Wang , Ming (2)
Rodriguez, Lulu (2)	Suggs, David (2)	Wang, Xiuli(1)
Roessner, Lori (2)	Tai, Zixue (1)	Wang, Yi(2)
Roozen, Irene(1)	Tamul, Daniel (2)	Warner, Benjamin(1)
Rosati, Clayton (1)	Tandoc Jr., Edson (2)	Washburn, Patrick(1)
Rupar, Verica (3)	Tang, Tang (1)	Wasike, Ben (2)
Rusciano, Frank (2)	Taylor, Maureen (3)	Waters, Richard(1)
Russial, John (2)	Thaker , Jagadish (1)	Watson, Brendan(1)
Santana, Arthur (2)	Theriault, Sean (1)	Weaver, David A.(1)
Sar, Sela (1)	Thomas, Ryan (3)	Weaver, David H.(1)
Scacco, Joshua(1)	Thomsen, Steven (2)	Weber, Matthew (1)
Schemer, Christian(1)	Thornton, Brian (1)	Weeks, Brian(3)
Schiappa, Edward(1)	Tirosh, Noam (1)	Wegenstein, Bernadette (1)
Schildkraut, Jaclyn(1)	Toth, Elizabeth (1)	Wei, Jiuchang (1)
Schill, Dan(1)	Tran, Hai (3)	Welch, Reed (2)
Schmidt, Hans(1)	Tremayne, Mark (1)	Whisenant, Benjamin (1)
Schneider, Andreas(1)	Tremlett, Annabel (1)	White, Teresa (1)
Schoenbach, Klaus (2)	Trepte, Sabine (1)	Whitmore, Nancy (2)
Schultz, Brad(1)	Tripathi, Rajesh (2)	Wilson, Chris (1)
Searles, Kathleen(1)	Trust, Rhonda (1)	Winburn, Jonathan (1)
Sendin, Jose (2)	Tulloch, Christopher(1)	Winter, Stephan (2)
Sengupta, Subir(1)	Tully, Melissa(1)	Wirth, Michael (2)
Sewell, John (1)	Turcotte, Jason (3)	Wise, Kevin (2)
Shafer, Autumn(1)	Ugland, Erik (2)	Wlezien, Christopher (1)
Shah, Dhavan(1)	van Atteveldt, Wouter (1)	Woelfel, Joseph (1)
Shain, Stacie (3)	Van den Bulck, Hilde (1)	Wojdynski, Bartosz (1)
Shao, Guosong (2)	van Reijmersdal, Eva (1)	Wonneberger, Anke (1)
Shay, Ronen(1)	Vanco, Bryan (1)	Wright, Patrick (1)
Sheafer, Tamir(1)	Vanden Bergh, Bruce (2)	Wu, Shi-Yen (2)
Sheets, Penny(1)	Vargas, Lucila (2)	Wu, Yue (2)
Sheffer, Mary Lou(1)	Vargo, Chris (2)	Xu, Kaibin (1)
Shen, Fuyuan(1)	Venger, Olesya (1)	Xu, Qian (2)
Shen, Hongmei(1)	Vergeer, Maurice (1)	Yamamoto, Masahiro (1)
Silver, Derigan(1)	Verma, J (1)	Yang, Aimei (1)
Slavtcheva-Petkova, Vera(2)	Vlienghart, Rens (2)	Yang, Kenneth (1)
Smith, Lauren(1)	Voakes, Paul (4)	Ye, Yinjiao(1)
So, Clement(1)	Volz, Yong (1)	Yeo, Tien Ee Dominic(1)
Song, Yunya(1)	von Sikorski, Christian (1)	Yoo, Joseph(1)
Sonnevend, Julia(1)	Vos, Tim (2)	Yoo, Sung Woo(1)

---

*(continued)*

(continued)

---

York, Chance (2)	Zamith, Rodrigo(1)	Zhang, Yuan(1)
Yu, Jusheng(1)	Zhang, Weiwu (2)	Zhao, Xinsu(1)
Yu, Nan (2)	Zhang, Xiaochen (1)	Zhong, Bu(2)
Yun, Gi Woong (3)	Zhang, Xiaoqun (5)	Zhou, Baohua(2)
Yungeng, Xie (1)	Zhang, Xinzhi(2)	Zhou, Shuhua (1)

---

Note. The list above also includes those who reviewed for our special issue *Information Access in the Age of Big Data*. Number of completed reviews in 2015 is included in parentheses.