

Peer Review Guidelines

GW Journal of Ethics in Publishing

The *Journal of Ethics in Publishing* welcomes articles, case studies, and conference presentations from scholars, students, and professionals on topics including, but not limited to, diversity and inclusion, accessibility, peer review, open access, sustainability, publishing metrics, equity, and other aspects and issues of ethics in publishing. Papers from underrepresented voices are especially encouraged to submit. Scholarly articles, case studies, and applied ethics (“Making the World Better” projects) are subject to peer review. Peer review will generally comprise double-masked peer review (wherein neither the author nor the reviewer know each other’s identity); the journal may also experiment, with authors’ permission, in alternative forms of peer review.

Peer review is a fundamental element of scholarly communication that provides valuable guidance to authors in the development and improvement of their submissions and protects journal integrity. Peer reviews should focus on adhering to the following values: equity, openness, collegiality, respect, quality, and community. Your comments will be anonymous (unless indicated in advance). Final determination will be made by the Editor-in-Chief after considering peer review from multiple reviewers.

PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES:

Before you review: When you receive a request to review, you should first assess the time commitment, your applicable expertise, and if you have any conflicts of interest. A conflict of interest can be financial, such as if you benefit from a product, service, or company that is mentioned in the submission. Other conflicts include personal or close professional relationships with the author(s), which could impact your review of the manuscript, either positively

or negatively. If you are unsure if something constitutes a conflict, you should contact the editor or include this information in your review.

Please provide 4-5 sentences in each section below, as applicable. You may write more to address each guiding question. Avoid yes/no answers. Although the review may be critical, please note that personal attacks will not be tolerated. Describe opportunities to improve the submission.

You do not necessarily need to address every question, as some may not be applicable; please note if a section/question does not seem to be applicable, or if it does not fall into your area of expertise. In the final section, please provide your recommendation to the editor. In addition, note if any subject matter within the article is outside your field of knowledge, or if there is anything, such as conflicting or competing interests, that may prevent you from providing a fair, unbiased review. Note that this submitted content is confidential and only shared for the purposes of peer review.

What are the overall strengths of this manuscript? Please give the most positive comments about the manuscript here. Consider some or all of the following:

- ✦ Is the topic interesting, timely, or relevant to issues of ethics in publishing?
- ✦ Is the article well-written or well-organized?
- ✦ Are the author's arguments clear, logical, and concise?
- ✦ Are the findings intriguing, surprising or new?
- ✦ Does the content address diversity, inclusivity, and equity issues, problems, or solutions?

Introduction, Argument and/or Literature Review: Consider some or all of the following:

- ✦ Is the premise or purpose of the submission clear?
- ✦ Is relevant literature reviewed in depth and synthesized across themes, methods, or findings, rather than by author? (Literature review may or may not be appropriate to all articles.)
- ✦ Are the authors' assumptions clarified and addressed?
- ✦ Do you understand how this submission contributes to the field?
- ✦ Is the writing well-organized and error free? (Note: grammar and spelling errors should not result in rejection.)
- ✦ Does the author clearly articulate a research problem and associated research questions?

Methodology (May not be relevant in all submissions.) Consider some or all of the following (as appropriate):

- ✦ Are the methods rigorous, thoughtful, or comprehensive?
- ✦ Does the author use appropriate methods to answer their research question; do they have a clear understanding of that method and has the method, itself, been described?
- ✦ Do you know who or what was studied, when the study took place, and how research was conducted? Has the study taken into account diversity and inclusivity as part of the design?
- ✦ Does the author describe the theoretical framework or parameters for this study clearly?
- ✦ When relevant, would you have enough information to replicate the study in another context?
- ✦ Did the author fully address limitations of the study design, such as participant sample used?

Findings/Results/Conclusion: Consider some or all of the following:

- ✦ Do the findings fit within the methods and literature review previously discussed?
- ✦ Is there a conclusion and is the conclusion logical and appropriate to what has come before in the body of the article?
- ✦ Is there sufficient evidence presented in the text for the conclusion, or for each finding?
- ✦ Are outliers, variance, weaknesses or contradictions in the results presented and discussed?
- ✦ Are the conclusions drawn in the paper original?

Discussion/Implications/Recommendations: Consider some or all of the following:

- ✦ Does the manuscript provide a clear summary of the purpose, method, and findings of the study at the end?
- ✦ Does the author make convincing connections between findings in this study and the field?
- ✦ Are connections between the findings/results and the theoretical framework/associated literature clear and logical?
- ✦ Are implications for this topic and future research or practice discussed?
- ✦ Do recommendations clearly stem from the findings/results?

Overall: Consider some or all of the following:

- ✦ Does the article contribute to the scholarly field; for example, is it original, valid, or add a contribution to ethical issues in publishing?
- ✦ Is the writing organized, precise, error-free, and without over-generalization or exaggeration?
- ✦ Are claims by the author supported with evidence?
- ✦ Is there a consistent use of style (Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) throughout?
- ✦ Is there a clear line of reasoning/argumentation?
- ✦ Does the article adhere to, follow, or further the mission of the journal?

Recommendations for publication (select one):

1. Accept, no revisions needed: Paper is well written and a significant contribution to the literature. No improvement needed.
2. Accept, with minor revisions: Well written, well-organized with some minor edits including formatting, grammar, or style suggestions required.
3. Revise, minor revisions requested: Well written, well-organized with some minor edits to arguments, research, or analysis. Additional including formatting, grammar, or style suggestions required.
4. Revise, major revisions requested: Paper is promising, but requires multiple major revisions, such as more research, depth, or analysis. Several sections require rewriting in order to improve clarity, flow, or arguments. Revised manuscript may undergo peer review again.
5. Revise & resubmit for review: Significant changes will need to be made in order to meet publication standards. Some major revisions needed with multiple minor revisions required. Revised manuscript's content will change and should go through peer review process again.
6. Reject for publication: Manuscript seems unable to conform to acceptable standards even after revision, or is inappropriate for the journal.
7. Out of Scope: Paper does not meet the scope or focus of journal.

Optional section:

Please use the area below for any comments to the editor that will not be provided to the author.