Manuscript Review Guidelines for Peer Reviewers for


This document provides details for the peer-reviewer when reviewing manuscripts and before the managing editor registers a decision on the status of the manuscript to authors. Allow these guidelines to assist you when making an overall decision for acceptance into the JSMAHS. Please complete the “Peer Review” form.

**Tasks to Complete:**

- Line Edits- for best success complete this within this peer review document, or as a separate word document.
- Peer Review Form

**BASIC FORMATTING STYLES**

**Headers to Include**

Dependent upon the type of research, specific headers may be necessary, including, but not limited to:

**Original Research**
- Introduction
- Results
- Limitations
- Future Research
- References

**Theoretical Piece**
- Introduction
- Implication

**Case Reports**
- Objective
- Differential Diagnosis (if clinical)
- Treatment (clinical case)
- Uniqueness
- Importance-Relevance to Practice

**Case Reports**
- History/Background
- Related Literature
- Conclusions/Outcomes/
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN REVIEWING

1. Does the research fit the JSMAHS scope and aims?
2. Is the manuscript titled appropriately?
3. Are the statistics appropriate for the design?
4. Are the body and conclusion written in sequential order?
5. Are the conclusions appropriate?
6. Does the discussion and implication fit the scope and aims appropriately?
7. Is the information valuable to the profession?

Peer Review Checklist

1. LINE SPECIFIC EDITING. This is either a separate word document & uploaded, or filled directly into the textbox provided (the plain text box DOES NOT SAVE your work). General Comments that Authors WILL SEE can be submitted in part 1.
2. Part 2: Reviewers can submit confidential comments that only the editors will see.
3.

PEER-REVIEW FORM

1. Please complete the portion below by indicating a score for the following Likert-style questions (upload this as a separate form in the
attachments section of your review. Please use the description of “PEER REVIEW FORM”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the research fit into the JSMAHS aims and scope?</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the manuscript titled appropriately?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the statistics appropriate comparative to the design?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the manuscript follow appropriate sequential order, and have strong readability?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the concluding portions appropriate?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Determine a decision on the manuscript and register this same decision within the peer-review portal.

“reject this submission without the option to resubmit”
“encourage major revisions”
“encourage minor revisions”
“accept submission as is”

*we can not accept any manuscript that does not have a formally registered decision AS WELL as specific line edits.

**Please remember, as a dedicated peer reviewer the time from agreement to decision should be within 21 days