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INTRODUCTION
Important partners in the scientific process & publication system

- reviewers
- authors
- editorial office
INTRODUCTION

Challenge of editors

• Find a sufficiently large group of reviewers who
  – are willing to serve the journal
  – produce, on-time, balanced scholarly reviews which help the editor’s decision-making
RECRUITING REVIEWERS

Challenges

• Type of reviewers
  – aims and scope of journal

• Source of reviewers
  – “inclusion” & “exclusion” criteria

• Soliciting potential reviewers
RETAINING REVIEWERS

Challenges

• Lack of time
• Relevance to area of interest
• Convenience of review process
• Recognition
RETAINING REVIEWERS

Lack of time

• Usual problem for busy researchers, academics or clinicians

• Very important not to overload reviewers
  – editor must have oversight
  – esp. over deputies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAD-1</td>
<td>Lesions of the biceps pulley: Diagnostic accuracy of MR arthrography of the shoulder and evaluation of established and new diagnostic criteria</td>
<td>16-Oct-2011</td>
<td>- Accept with Revisions (25-Nov-2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- a revision has been started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD-1</td>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging of Osteoradionecrosis of the Upper Cervical Spine Following Radiotherapy for Head and Neck Cancer: Differentiation from Recurrent or Metastatic Disease Running Title: MRI of upper C spine osteoradionecrosis</td>
<td>12-Sep-2011</td>
<td>- Accept with Revisions (07-Oct-2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- a revision has been submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD-1</td>
<td>Reduction of metal artifacts at MR imaging with Slice Encoding Metal Artifact Correction (SEMAC) and View-Angle Tilting (VAT) in patients with total hip arthroplasty: Performance of STIR and T1-weighted sequences</td>
<td>15-Dec-2011</td>
<td>- Under Consideration (10-Jan-2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD-1</td>
<td>In Assessing Local Recurrence Following Surgical Resection of Soft Tissue Tumors by Unenhanced MRI, do Additional Gadolinium-enhanced Images Change Reader Confidence or Diagnosis?</td>
<td>12-Jan-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Relevance to area of interest

• Accurate matching of manuscript to potential reviewer
  – topic of interest
  – relevance to own current work
  – contribution of paper to own area of interest/ subspecialty
RETAINING REVIEWERS

Convenience of review process

• Editorial workflow
  – should be efficient and hassle-free
  – courteous request letters
  – check availability a must
  – ease of reviewing process
  – note of thanks post review
Indian Journal of Cancer  
admin@indianjcancer.com  
to me

Dear Prof. Peh

May we request you to give your valuable opinion on manuscript entitled 'Misdiagnosis of the Effect of Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factor on Magnetic Resonance Imaging in a Leukemia Patient'. The manuscript has been submitted to the Indian Journal of Cancer for consideration for publication.

The manuscript is uploaded for your review at our web-based peer review site http://www.journalonweb.com/ijc.

If you face any difficulty with the system, please get back to us.

Thanking you,

Sincerely yours,

Editor

Indian Journal of Cancer

Click on link or copy paste the URL in browser
To view article -> http://www.journalonweb.com/ijc/vrex.asp?a=v&id=wilfred.peh&em=wilfred.peh@gmail.com&mid=IJC_193_11
To accept to review article -> http://www.journalonweb.com/ijc/vrex.asp?a=a&id=wilfred.peh&em=wilfred.peh@gmail.com&mid=IJC_193_11
To decline reviewing this article -> http://www.journalonweb.com/ijc/vrex.asp?a=d&id=wilfred.peh&em=wilfred.peh@gmail.com&mid=IJC_193_11

To access to the article please use following username and password.
Dear Professor Peh:

We have received manuscript RAD-1234 entitled, "In Assessing Local Recurrence Following Surgical Resection of Soft Tissue Tumors by Unenhanced MRI, do Additional Gadolinium-enhanced Images Change Reader Confidence or Diagnosis?" and have selected you as a potential reviewer. For your information, the Abstract of the manuscript is found below. Your review will be due in 14 days.

You may e-mail me with your reply or click the appropriate link below to automatically register your reply with our online manuscript submission and review system.

Once you accept our invitation to review this manuscript, you will be notified via e-mail about how to access Manuscript Central, our online manuscript submission and review system. You will then have access to the manuscript and reviewer instructions in your Reviewer Center.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible so that reviewer assignment can be accomplished quickly.

Agreed: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rad?URL_MASK=Ss5CKCnbmhPCMtSTpJ4

Declined: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rad?URL_MASK=4GFDi3q2sPwJXyDfYBf

(Alternatively, if you are not able to review this manuscript because you will be unavailable for a specific period of time, please click the reply button and inform us of your unavailable dates.)

Deborah Hogan
RADIOLOGY Editorial Office
617-236-7376

Abstract:

Purpose
1. Evaluate if gadolinium enhanced MR imaging (GdMRI) improves confidence or changes the final diagnosis in the assessment of musculoskeletal (MSK) tumor residual or recurrence following surgical resection
2. Assess if different experience levels change the above results.

Methods and Materials
Initially, pre-contrast images were independently reviewed by 2 radiologists, one with 25 years of experience (R1) and one undergoing MSK specialty training (R2). Three questions were answered: 1. Mass present? 2. Cystic, necrotic, solid? 3. Likelihood of malignancy? Subsequently, both pre-contrast and post-contrast images were independently reviewed. The same questions were again answered plus 6 others including if GdMRI: better defined cystic versus solid, better defined extent, improved conspicuity, changed confidence, and changed diagnosis.

Conclusions
There were no significant differences in confidence or diagnosis in the assessment of residual or recurrent musculoskeletal tumor with the use of gadolinium-enhanced MR imaging.
Reviewer: Wilfred CG Peh

Manuscript ID: YMJ

Title: Differences between magnetic resonance imaging and computed tomography–myelography for quantitative evaluation of lumbar intracanalar lesion cross-sections

Dear Dr. Wilfred CG Peh:

Recently, I sent you to review manuscript entitled "Differences between magnetic resonance imaging and computed tomography–myelography for quantitative evaluation of lumbar intracanalal lesion cross-sections" I have not yet to hear from you about this.

This e-mail is simply a reminder to review. I appreciate your help in accomplishing our goal of having an expedited reviewing process. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely yours,

In-Hong Choi, M.D., Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief
Yonsei Medical Journal
Dear Dr. Wilfred CG Peh:

Greetings from the Yonsei Medical Journal. We've received well your valuable comments about the submitted paper titled "Differences between magnetic resonance imaging and computed tomography–myelography for quantitative evaluation of lumbar intracanalar lesion cross-sections". It will be greatly contributed to the high standards for the Journal, and we thank you for your participation as a referee. Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Yonsei Medical Journal
http://www.eymj.org
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Recognition

- By journal
- Department
- Institution
- National
  - e.g. CME accreditation
The American Roentgen Ray Society offers CME credit for manuscript review.

Accreditation Statement
The American Roentgen Ray Society (ARRS) is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) to provide continuing medical education activities for physicians.

Designation Statement
The ARRS designates this educational activity for a maximum of 3 AMA PRA Category 1 Credit(s)?. The physician should only claim credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.
The American Medical Association has determined that physicians not licensed in the US who participate in this CME activity are eligible for AMA PRA Category 1 Credit(s)?.

Target Audience: Physicians and other radiology professionals who review manuscripts submitted to the AJR for possible publication.

Goals and Objectives: After completing the review of the manuscript assigned to the individual reviewer by one of the editors of the AJR, the reviewer should have improved his or her skills in performing critical analyses of the medical literature and his or her knowledge of current issues and developments in the field of radiology and allied sciences. This improved skill level and knowledge base should result in increased skill in reviewing and authoring future journal articles, as well as improved behavior and performance in practice.

Disclosure of Commercial Interest: The authors of this article about to be reviewed, and the Editor-in-Chief, have indicated that they do not have a financial relationship with a commercial organization that may have a direct or indirect interest in the subject matter being presented.

If your review is deemed acceptable by the Section Editor, then this CME activity may be eligible for (3) CME credits.

The main contact point for the Peer Review staff is:

Ann Earwood  
Peer Review Specialist  
American Roentgen Ray Society  
Phone: 703-858-4331  
Email: AJRsubmit@arrs.org

We thank you in advance for your time and continued support of the journal.

Best regards,

Donna G. Blankenbaker, MD  
AJR Section Editor
Continuing Medical Education

Continuing medical education (CME) consists of educational activities that serve to maintain, develop or increase the knowledge, skills and professional performance of a doctor.

Compulsory CME

Beyond medical school and housemanship, each doctor needs to keep himself or herself current with changes in medicine generally and in areas relevant to his own practice in particular. Patients and society at large also want to be assured that the doctors they consult are practising up-to-date medicine and offering them good quality care. For these reasons, the Singapore Medical Council (SMC) has made CME compulsory for all doctors in Singapore with effect from 1 January 2003.

Since 1 January 2005, all fully and conditionally registered doctors renewing their practising certificates (PCs) are required to meet the compulsory CME requirements for their CME qualifying period(s) before their PCs are renewed.

The SMC-CME Coordinating Committee accredits CME programmes / activities and reviews CME policies and programmes. The Committee includes representatives from the Academy of Medicine Singapore, College of Family Physicians Singapore, Singapore Medical Association, as well as doctors working in both the public and private sectors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Credit Points Awarded</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorship</strong> of original paper in <em>Refereed Journals / MOH Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) / Medical Textbook</em>&lt;br&gt;- Main Author</td>
<td>5 CME points per paper / MOH CPG / textbook chapter</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 CME points per paper / MOH CPG / textbook chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorship</strong> of modules for Online Education or Distance-Learning Programmes (DLP)</td>
<td>2 CME points per module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editorial Work / Reviewer</strong> for <em>Refereed Journals and Medical Textbooks</em>&lt;br&gt;- Chief Editor</td>
<td>5 CME points per journal / textbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Subsidiary Editor</td>
<td>2 CME points per journal / textbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reviewer</td>
<td>2 CME points per journal / textbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong> of <em>Original</em> Paper / Poster (regardless of duration)</td>
<td>2 CME points per paper / poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctors can claim CME points for being the main / subsidiary author, chief / subsidiary editor, reviewer or presenter for the above CME activities. These publications must not be published more than 2 years prior to making the CME claims.
REWARDING REVIEWERS

Challenges

• Financial incentives
• Non-financial incentives
• Exceptional reviewers
REWARDING REVIEWERS

Financial incentives

• Very few journals can afford this
• Are reviewers really financially motivated?
REWARDING REVIEWERS

Financial incentives

• Payment to reviewers (v rare)
• Free journal subscription? (rare)
• Free reprints for limited period
• Free access to journal database
REWARDING REVIEWERS

Financial incentives

• Discount off
  – manuscript submission fee
  – purchase of society publications
  – congress fee
  – society subscription
Canadian Association of Radiologists Journal

Dear Professor Peh,

I would greatly appreciate your assistance in the review of a manuscript that has recently been submitted. Are you able to review the following manuscript for the CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF RADIOLOGISTS JOURNAL?

Article Title: An overview of Vertebroplasty: current status, controversies and future directions
Manuscript Number: CAR-J-D

I have included the abstract of the manuscript below to provide you with an overview:

ABSTRACT:
Vertebroplasty is a cost-effective procedure for the relief of pain in appropriately selected patients when performed by a skilled practitioner. The currently accepted indications and contraindications for vertebroplasty are reviewed. The techniques routinely employed by the authors are presented, including a discussion of recognized complications. Recent controversy has highlighted weaknesses in the practice of technology evaluation, and future more robust studies will be required to address these issues across the board in the future more scientifically than has been done in the past.

Your expert opinion would greatly help me in deciding whether to publish and the changes that might be suggested to the authors. Furthermore, the time you spend reviewing this manuscript can be used for continuing professional development credits.

If you accept this invitation, your comments will be due in 21 days. If you are unable to act as a reviewer at this time, I would greatly appreciate your suggestions for alternate reviewers.

If you are willing to review this manuscript, please click on the link below:
http://ees.elsevier.com/car1/asp?id=29105&md5=1Y14G

If you are unable, please click on the link below. We would appreciate receiving suggestions for alternative reviewers:
http://ees.elsevier.com/car1/asp?id=29098&md5=J39LRV16

Alternatively, you may register your response by accessing the Elsevier Editorial System for CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF RADIOLOGISTS JOURNAL as a REVIEWER using the login credentials below:

To help you review this manuscript you are granted free access to Scopus for 30 days after accepting this invitation. Scopus is the largest abstract and citation database of research literature and quality web sources. With Scopus, it is easy to find references, similar articles or papers by the same authors.

Yours sincerely,

Sincerely,

Savvas Nicolaou, MD, FRCPC
Deputy Editor
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF RADIOLOGISTS JOURNAL
Thank you for the review of CARJ-D-

1 message

Canadian Association of Radiologist Journal <eesserver@eemail.elsevier.com> 16 March 2017 at 19:30
Reply-To: Canadian Association of Radiologist Journal <editor@car.ca>
To: wilfred.peh@gmail.com

Ms. Ref. No.: CARJ-D-
Title: Quantitative Magnetic Resonance Imaging of Meniscal Pathology Ex Vivo
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF RADIOLOGISTS JOURNAL

Dear Professor Wilfred CG Peh,

Thank you for taking the time to review the above-referenced manuscript.

To access your comments, please do the following:

1. Go to this URL: https://ees.elsevier.com/carj/
2. Enter your login details
3. Click [Reviewer Login]

Thank you again for sharing your time and expertise.

If you have not yet activated or completed your 30 days of access to Scopus and ScienceDirect, you can still access them via this link:

http://scopees.elsevier.com/ees_login.asp?journalacronym=CARJ&username=wilfred.peh@gmail.com

You can use your EES password to access Scopus and ScienceDirect via the URL above. You can save your 30 days access period, but access will expire 6 months after you accepted to review.

Yours sincerely,

Peter L Munk, MDCM, FRCPC, FSIR
Editor
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF RADIOLOGISTS JOURNAL
Dear Professor Peh,

Thank you for your review of manuscript BJR-D-16 entitled "Low-grade Myofibroblastic Sarcoma: Clinical and Imaging Findings".

You can access the review comments as well as the final disposition (when available) by logging on to Editorial Manager as a Reviewer at http://bjr.edmgr.com/

The submission will be in your Completed Assignments folder.

As a token of our appreciation for your assistance, we are pleased to advise you that a copy of this message may be used as a voucher with a nominal value of £20. The voucher is not transferable and cannot be used in conjunction with any other offer.

The voucher will be valid for two years and can be redeemed in one of three ways:

1. Set against the purchase price of a BIR publication - for a BIR member this would be the discounted price. For details regarding BIR publications visit http://www.bir.org.uk/publications/

2. Set against the cost of a BIR meeting. For details regarding BIR meetings please visit http://www.bir.org.uk/education-and-events/

3. For a non-member, reduction in the cost of the first year's subscription on becoming a BIR member. For details regarding BIR membership visit http://www.bir.org.uk/join-us/
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Non-financial incentives

• Acknowledgement of contribution
• Feedback about manuscript fate
• Invitations to social events
The SNL Editorial Board would like to thank our reviewers for the substantial amount of time devoted to the review process and for their expertise, which has helped to guide the quality of articles published in the Journal in 2016. The names listed below are individuals who have returned their reviews during the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016. Editorial Board members are acknowledged on the journal masthead and are therefore not included in this list.

| Aodil Lateef Fatmah | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Bee | Chow Min Be...
TO: Prof. Wilfred C.G. Peh  
Khoo Teck Puat Hospital

RE: Editor Decision for Journal Review - AJR MS 17-

Dear Dr. Peh,

We would like to thank you again for your time and efforts in preparing a review of the above referenced manuscript. The decision of the editors was: Reconsider with Minor Revision.

If the authors choose to resubmit their paper with revisions, you may be asked to review the edited version. We hope that you will be willing to help us with further reviews of this manuscript.

MANUSCRIPT NO: 17- REVIEW SUBMITTED ON: February 27, 2017  
SECTION OR SUBSPECIALTY: Musculoskeletal Imaging  
MANUSCRIPT TYPE: Solicited - Review  
ENTITLED: Advance Magnetic Resonance Imaging Techniques for the Ankle

-----------------------------

DECISION LETTER SENT TO THE AUTHOR:

To: *******
From: "AJR Journal Staff" ajrsSubmit@arrs.org  
Subject: Decision Letter for AJR MS 17-
Dear Dr. Peh:

I hope that you will attend the 2013 RadioGraphics Reviewers’ Breakfast during this year’s RSNA Annual Meeting. The breakfast will be held **Tuesday, December 3rd, from 7:00 to 8:30 AM in the Lakeside Center, Room E253AB.** We hold this event every year as a gesture of our appreciation of your efforts on behalf of the Journal.

Please RSVP by replying to this e-mail (eallen@rsna.org) by October 28th.

Thank you and we hope to see you at the breakfast.

ARRS 117th Annual Meeting-AJR Reviewers Luncheon Invitation

Dear Dr. Peh,

By now, you should have received information about the 2017 ARRS Annual Meeting, April 30-May 5, 2017, in New Orleans, LA. For those of you planning on attending, I hope you will be able to join your fellow AJR reviewers and me at a special AJR Reviewers Luncheon on Monday, May 1. The Luncheon is one small way ARRS can say “Thank you” for the vital contributions reviewers make all year to the AJR and to the profession.

The luncheon will be held in the Imperial 5 room, Hyatt Regency New Orleans from 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. If you have not yet registered for the ARRS Annual Meeting, you may want to do so before March 31 when registration closes for the meeting. Your meeting registration badge will be necessary for admission to the luncheon.
Volunteer Recognition Reception

As a volunteer with the Canadian Association of Radiologists, we would like to thank you for all your valuable contributions to the Association and to the profession of radiology. The CAR exists because of volunteers like you.

In recognition of these contributions, we would like to invite you to the

CAR Wine & Cheese Reception
Saturday, April 22, 2017
5:30 p.m.

Le Centre Sheraton Montreal
Salle de bal est, Level 4
1201 René Lévesque Blvd. West
Montreal, Quebec

This event will be held during the CAR 80th Annual Scientific Meeting.

We look forward to seeing you there.
REWARDING REVIEWERS

Exceptional reviewers

• Editor’s assessment system
  – grading by number, quality and timeliness

• Certificate of distinction

• Appointment to Editorial Board
Singapore Med J reviewer tracking system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>210: General Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.090: Hepatobiliary Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.110: Pancreatic Surgery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Review Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Reviewer Invitation Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Invitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Reviewer Performance Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Completed Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Reviewer Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days to Respond to Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Recommendation Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accept: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Revision: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Revision: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Khoo Teck Puat Hospital
Alexandra Health
The Singapore Medical Journal Reviewer Recognition Awards 2016

The successful publication of a peer-reviewed journal requires substantial contribution of time and effort by numerous reviewers. I am pleased to specially highlight a group of individuals who will now receive well-deserved credit for the high quality of their timely, detailed and scholarly reviews, i.e. the recipients of the 2016 SMJ Reviewer Recognition Awards. Each award recipient will receive a Certificate of Reviewing with Distinction and a letter of congratulations, underscoring the importance of reviewing as an academic and professional activity. Our dedicated Editorial Board members are already recognised each month on the SMJ masthead, and are thus not eligible for this award.

Poh Kian Keong
Editor-in-Chief

Abdul Lateef Fatimah
Ang Eng Tat
Aw Chen Wee
Balakrishnan Ashokka
Chandran Rajkumar
Chee Bin Eng Cynthia
Chen Yongqiang Jerry
Cheng Kui Sing Anton
Chew Chee Ping
Chew Min Hoe
Chiow Adrian
Cho Li Wei
Chotirmall Sanjay Haresh
Chow Li Ping Angela
Das Undurti N
Goh E Shaun
Goh Siang Hong
Htwe Than Than
Kajiya Takashi
Koh Keng Hee
Koh Kwong Fah
Kojodjojo Pipin
Lapeña Fabella Jose Florencio
Lee Wei Rhen Warren
Lim Patrick
Lim Wei Ming Wilfred
Lim Yean Chin
Loke Kah Yin
Lye Chien Boon David
Nalliah Sivalingam
Ngu Chi-Yong James
Ong Biauw Chi
Ong Kiat Hoe
Phua Eng Joo
Poon Woei Bing
Salcido-Ochoa Francisco
Tan Hock Heng
Tan Lay Kok
Tan Ming Yee Giles
Tan Tong-Khee
Tay Yong Kwang
Teng Cheong Lieng
Tiah Ling
Tien Sim Leng
Tor Phean Chorn
Wan Yi Min
Wong BS Steven
Wong Siang Yih Andrew
Wong Teck Yee
Yuen Heng Wai
Editor’s Recognition Award 2007

for reviewing with

Distinction

is presented to

Wilfred Peh, MD

In recognition of outstanding service as a reviewer
of scientific manuscripts submitted for publication in
European Journal of Radiology
European Journal of Radiology Extra

Herwig Imhof, MD

Editor, European Journal of Radiology

Vienna, January 2008
Radiology

Editor’s Recognition Award
for reviewing with
Distinction

is presented to

Wilfred C.G. Peh, MD, FRCP, FRCR

in recognition of outstanding service as a reviewer of scientific manuscripts submitted for publication in Radiology.

Herbert Y. Kressel, MD

Herbert Y. Kressel, MD
Editor, Radiology

December 2010
Certificate of Distinction

Awarded to

Dr Wilfred Peh

Skeletal Radiology wishes to recognize your contribution to the Journal as a reviewer of distinction.

This certificate signifies that in quantity, timeliness, and quality of your work on behalf of the Journal during 2010 was above and beyond the call of duty.

The Editors offer sincere thanks,

Murali Sundaram, MD
Daniel Rosenthal, MD
Juerg Hodler, MD

Skeletal Radiology

Journal of the International Skeletal Society
A Journal of Radiology, Pathology and Orthopaedics

Springer
the language of science
2012 Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology (JVIR) Editor’s Award for Distinguished Reviewer. Dr. Suresh Babu Balasubramanian.

Award presented in San Francisco, 2012
American Journal of Orthopedics

Editorial Board

Chief of Editor
Siong Aik

Editorial Board
Aminah Buligba
K S Sivathanth
Lisa King Ting
Mohammad Hassan Shukur
Sharaf Ibrahim
Subr Sengupta
Zi Yuan

International Advisory Board
Aqil Nather
Benjamin Joseph
Christopher Mow
Ian Leahey
Ken N Kuo
Lawrence Yap

Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal

American Journal of Roentgenology

American Roentgen Ray Society publishes the American Journal of Roentgenology

Editor in Chief
Thomas H.农副产品, MD, MPH
Adrion Office, Jacksonville, FL

Section Editors
C. F. Fischman, MD, PhD; Thomas C. Gerber, MD, PhD; Jiri G. Goo, MD (Asia); Loren H. Kiel, MD; U. Joseph Scheep, MD

Musculoskeletal Imaging
Donna G. Blankenkamp, MD

Assistant Editors
Jon A. Jacobson, MD, Mark D. Murphy, MD

Neuroradiology and Head and Neck Imaging
James M. Provenzale, MD

Assistant Editors
Andrew Y. Wang, MD

Goldenthal
The British Institute of Radiology most gratefully acknowledges the contribution of

Wilfred Peh

for his role as Senior Editor of BJR in 2016

Dear Wilfred,
Thank you for your hard work as a BJR Senior Editor in 2016, it is enormously appreciated. Here's a token of our appreciation, hopefully you can use it to buy something exciting! We look forward to working with you in 2017,
BJR Team

$60.00
Amazon.com Gift Card
SUMMARY

• Retaining and rewarding (good) reviewers are a challenge for journal editors

• Good reviewers are worth their weight (in gold) and deserve innovative efforts to keep them
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION

Pahang, Malaysia

Tagaytay Highlands, The Philippines

Hue, Vietnam