

Excerpt: Anti-Racist Scholarly Reviewing Practices

IEEE ProComm is committed to anti-racist scholarly reviewing practices. In addition to incorporating the recommendations of the Anti-Racist Scholarly Reviewing Practices for the overall editorial process, we encourage our reviewers to follow anti-racist practices in their reviewing.

This document is an excerpt of Section 5A of the original 11-page document.¹ It is intended as a quick reminder/checklist for reviewers at IEEE ProComm and not a substitute for the original document. For their fullness of understanding of the complexities and commitments of anti-racist reviewing practices, reviewers are highly encouraged to consult the original document in full and refer back to it as reminders of intentions behind individual checklist items.

Reviewers should recognize a range of expertise and encourage citation practices that represent diverse canons, epistemological foundations, and ways of knowing. We encourage reviewers to embrace these practices.

- Reviewers and editors can mentor authors on how to frame articles within the context of field conversations.
- Reviewers and editors frame reviewer comments supporting author revisions.
- Reviewers and editors recognize that citation practices are political. We form communities of practice/discourse communities in how we cite, excluding and including particular ways of knowing. We give particular ideas power and visibility in how we cite. Impacts coming from reviewer actions include indicators about whose work matters, who should be tenured and promoted, who belongs.
- Reviewers should recommend pieces to cite from a wide variety of expertise and voice; lack of certain “canonical” citations is not automatically grounds for rejection.
- Reviewers should resist requiring the existing canon be cited and recognize that some canonical work may be purposefully uncited because of oppressive and harmful actions taken by those authors.
- Reviewers and editors can recommend relevant work by multiply marginalized and underrepresented (MMU) scholars to authors.
- Reviewers and editors should recognize and support research that pushes at field boundaries and consider how to encourage authors to show connections without shutting down or being defensive about expansion.
- Reviewers and editors should read and respond to work on its own terms without demanding it be reframed through dominant forms of expertise.
- Reviewers should respect lived experiences as a source of expertise and excellence where appropriate.
- Reviewers and editors should account for the relationship between positionalities and expertises and value a variety of expertise; do not position one kind of expertise as universal.
- Reviewers and editors should resist reflexively suggesting that certain work is not within the purview of the field.
- Reviewers and editors should value and be willing to imagine the field beyond their individual perspectives.

¹ Anti-racist scholarly reviewing practices: A heuristic for editors, reviewers, and authors. (2021). Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/reviewheuristic>.