

GUIDELINES REVIEWERS

Dear Reviewer, please read below the text and reflect before you will decide to review the manuscript.

Before you accept or decline, consider the following questions:

- Does the article match your *area of expertise*? Only accept if you feel you can provide a high quality review.
- Do you have a potential *conflict of interest*? Disclose this to the editor when you respond.
- Do you have *time*? Reviewing can be a lot of work – before you commit, make sure you can meet the deadline.
- Respond to the invitation as soon as you can – delay in your decision slows down the review process, whether you agree to review or not. If you decline the invitation, provide suggestions for alternative reviewers.
- Your review will help the editor decide whether or not to publish the article. Giving your overall opinion and general observations of the article is essential.
- Your comments should be courteous and constructive, and should not include any personal remarks or personal details including your name.
- First read the article and then take a break from it, giving you time to think. Consider the article from your own perspective. When you sit down to write the review, make sure you know what the journal is looking for, and have a copy of any specific reviewing criteria you need to consider.
- Your review will help the editor decide whether or not to publish the article.
- Giving your overall opinion and general observations of the article is essential. Your comments should be courteous and constructive, and should not include any personal remarks or personal details including your name.
- Providing insight into any deficiencies is important. You should explain and support your judgement so that both editors and authors are able to fully understand the reasoning behind your comments. You should indicate whether your comments are your own opinion or are reflected by the data.
- When you make a recommendation, it is worth considering the categories the editor most likely uses for classifying the article: i) Reject (explain reason in report); ii) Accept without revision; iii) Revise – either major or minor (explain the revision that is required, and indicate to the editor whether or not you would be happy to review the revised article).

- The editor ultimately decides whether to accept or reject the article. The editor will weigh all views and may call for a third opinion or ask the author for a revised paper before making a decision.

The ARHSSII's reviewers do not have to fill in standard evaluation forms. But we do ask all reviewers to reflect in a written format on the following questions:

- Is the article related to the main topics of the Journal?
- Will it help our readers to make better decisions and, if so, how?
- Will the article add enough to existing knowledge?
- Does the article read well and make sense? Does it have a clear message?
- Originality — does the work add enough to what is already in the published literature? If so, what does it add? Please cite relevant references to support your comments on originality.
- Importance of the work to general readers — does this work matter to researchers, policymakers, educators, learners and etc.? Will it help our readers to make better decisions and, if so, how?
- Scientific reliability:
 - i) Research question — clearly defined and appropriately answered?
 - ii) Overall design of study — appropriate and adequate to answer the research question?
 - iii) Participants — adequately described, their conditions defined, inclusion and exclusion criteria described? How representative were they of patients whom this evidence might affect?
 - iv) Methods — adequately described? Main outcome measure clear? Was the study ethical (this may go beyond simply whether the study was approved by an ethics committee)?
 - v) Results — answer the research question? Credible? Well presented?
 - vi) Interpretation and conclusions — warranted by and sufficiently derived from/focused on the data? Discussed in the light of previous evidence? Message clear?
 - vii) References - up to date and relevant? Any omissions?
 - viii) Summary what this paper adds — reflect accurately what the paper says?
 - ix) Documents in the supplemental files - Do they contain information that should be better reported in the manuscript, or raise questions about the work?

Not all of these points will be relevant for non-research articles. Please use your discretion about the above list when reporting on other types of article.