


Reviewing

As a reviewer, you will learn of the review request via email or by checking your dashboard:



The screenshot shows the OJS (Open Journal Systems) dashboard for a reviewer. The page title is "Journal of Public Knowledge" and the user is logged in as "agallego". The main navigation bar includes "Submissions" and "Archives". The "My Assigned" section is active, displaying a list of tasks. The table below shows the details of these tasks, including their IDs, titles, and current stages.

ID	Author; Title	Stage
	Management Systems	
▶ 19	Hydrologic Connectivity in the Edwards Aquifer between San Marcos Springs and Barton Springs during 2009 Drought Conditions	Review
▶ 33	System Dynamics in Distance Education and a Call to Develop a Standard Model	Published
▶ 36	KFS Computer Science Journal	Production
▶ 52	approach for externalization of expert tacit knowledge	Review

11 of 11 items

From the My Assigned list, find the title and Review link. Notice the lack of any author information in this double-blind peer review process.

Selecting the Review link will take you to the first review step in the submission record, which is much more limited than the editor's view, and contains no author information.

Review: *approach for externalization of expert tacit knowledge*

1. Request

2. Guidelines

3. Download & Review

4. Completion

Request for Review

You have been selected as a potential reviewer of the following submission. Below is an overview of the submission, as well as the timeline for this review. We hope that you are able to participate.

Article Title

approach for externalization of expert tacit knowledge

Abstract

E-learning or electronic learning platforms facilitate delivery of the knowledge spectrum to the learning community through information and communication technologies. The transfer of knowledge takes place from experts to learners, and externalization of the knowledge transfer is significant. In the e-learning environment, the learners seek subject expertise to clarify their subject queries, and a learner query can be routed to an expert for externalization of expert knowledge provided the learner knows the subject expert or the expertise group. However, learners new to e-learning systems are not aware of the expertise group to which the query should be sent, which results in time delays, non-response, inaccurate solutions and loss of knowledge capture. Several models have been proposed to resolve this task, but thus far, these efforts have focused completely on returning the most conversant people as experts on a particular topic to retrieve valuable knowledge. To address this problem, we propose an approach that externalizes the tacit knowledge of a subject expert by creating a dynamic query handling system that automatically transfers a user query to the best subject expert.

This first step consists of the following sections:

Request for Review: provides some text inviting you to act as a reviewer.

Article Title: provides the title of the article.

Abstract: provides the abstract text.

Further down the screen, you will find additional information.

[View All Submission Details](#)

Review Schedule

<input type="text" value="2016-08-30"/>	<input type="text" value="2016-09-20"/>	<input type="text" value="2016-09-27"/>
<i>Editor's Request</i>	<i>Response Due Date</i>	<i>Review Due Date</i>

[About Due Dates](#)

Accept Review, Continue to Step #2

Decline Review Request

The **View All Submission Details** link will open a window with additional information, including all of the non-author metadata:

View All Submission Details ✕

Articles

Prefix **Title ***

Examples: A, The

Subtitle

The optional subtitle will appear after a colon (:), following the main title.

Abstract *

Note that none of these fields are editable by the reviewer, and are only provided to help you conduct a thorough review.

Close this window and move further down the screen. From here you can see the Review Schedule, including all of the relevant due dates.

From here, you can decline or accept the review. If you decline, you will be dropped from the process. If you accept, you will move to review step 2, where you would be able to read any reviewer guidelines provided by the journal.

Review: *approach for externalization of expert tacit knowledge*

1. Request 2. Guidelines 3. Download & Review 4. Completion

Reviewer Guidelines

Please complete the review with a constructive perspective.

[Continue to Step #3](#) [Go Back](#)

Hit **Continue** to move to step 3. From here you can download a copy of the review files and enter your review comments. The first window is for comments to the editor and the author; the second window is just for the editor.

Review: *approach for externalization of expert tacit knowledge*

1. Request 2. Guidelines 3. Download & Review 4. Completion

Review Files

Q Search









 163-1 Author, submission-manuscript.docx Article Text

Reviewer Guidelines

[Review Guidelines](#)

Review

Enter (or paste) your review of this submission into the form below.

  **B** *I* U      Upload 

This is a very good article.

Once you have read the paper and added your comments, scroll down the page to optionally upload a marked up copy of the review file (remember to strip any personal identification from the file before uploading it).

Upload

Upload files you would like the editor and/or author to consult, including revised versions of the original review file(s).

Reviewer Files

Q Search

Upload File

No Files

Recommendation

Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Choose One 

Submit Review

[Go Back](#)

* Denotes required field

Next, you must then make your recommendation using the dropdown menu.

Your choices include:

Accept Submission: it is ready to go to Copyediting as is.

Revisions Required: it requires minor changes that can be reviewed and accepted by the editor.


Resubmit for Review: it requires major changes and another round of peer review.

Resubmit Elsewhere: it doesn't seem like a good fit for the focus and scope of this journal.


Decline Submission: it has too many weakness to ever be accepted.

See Comments: if none of the above recommendations make sense, you can leave a comment for the editor detailing your concerns.

Finally, hit the Submit Review button to complete your task. You'll be asked to confirm.



Hit OK. You will be taken to the final confirmation screen thanking you for your work.



Review Submitted

Thank you for completing the review of this submission. Your review has been submitted successfully. We appreciate your contribution to the quality of the work that we publish; the editor may contact you again for more information if needed.

That's it! The review is now complete.