



## **Reviewer Expectations for the Journal of the Pharmacy Society of Wisconsin**

Peer review is an integral part of publishing original research to ensure the articles selected by *The Journal of the Pharmacy Society of Wisconsin (The Journal)* are of the highest quality possible. The peer reviewer guidelines described here were developed for *The Journal* based on the peer review policies and requirements of other peer-reviewed journals. Reviewers for *The Journal* are volunteers and are providing a service to *The Journal* by screening articles and giving authors feedback prior to publication.

When initially asked to review a paper for *The Journal*, reviewers must first decide if they have the expertise and time available to critique the paper. Any potential conflicts of interest should be communicated to the editor, Michael Nagy (mnagy@pswi.org), at this time. A new reviewer should allow at least 2-3 hours to complete a thorough review and provide a written feedback report on the Peer Review Evaluation Criteria Checklist. The appropriate timeframe to return a finished review is two weeks. If a reviewer feels they will not be able to meet the deadline for any reason, the review should be declined in a timely manner so a new reviewer can be assigned.

Manuscript drafts should be considered confidential and should not be discussed until after publication. It may be appropriate to review manuscript drafts with a peer or in a journal club setting. The complete list of reviewers should be included in the written review. If any reviewer, including those in a journal club setting, is found to discuss an unpublished manuscript outside of the peer-review process, they will no longer be asked to participate in article reviews for *The Journal*.



The peer review process for *The Journal* is double blinded to minimize bias in publication recommendations. In most situations, there will be one to two separate reviewers per article. Reviewers should not attempt to directly contact the writer except for in their written review; recommendations or requests for more information should be submitted to the editor.

Reviewers will be expected to complete The Journal Peer Review Evaluation Criteria Checklist when reviewing a manuscript draft. This document serves to assist reviewers in critically and thoroughly reviewing the manuscript. Once the evaluation checklist is completed, reviewers are expected to submit a written review to the Editor of *The Journal* with feedback on the document and a recommendation regarding publication of the manuscript.

It is not the objective of the reviewer to edit a paper for grammar or writing style, but rather provide feedback focused on the content of the manuscript. The reviewer may refer to the existence of these errors if they are significant and could preclude publication or prevent clear understanding of the work, but the reviewer should not attempt to correct them. Reviewers are not expected to recalculate statistics as raw data will not be available. Reviewers should check that reasonable statistical tests are used and should double-check totals within tables and compare them to the text (that all cases are accounted for).

Reviewers are expected to give constructive feedback to improve the manuscript prior to publication. In that respect, feedback on how the methods should have been conducted is not constructive for a prospective project, as methods cannot be changed at that time. It is common to have additional comments or feedback for the editor that is not meant for the authors. If that scenario arises, comments to the editor can be submitted as a separate document. Despite



having a blinded peer review process, it is encouraged to stay courteous and constructive in feedback given to authors.

An additional reference on how to properly review a potential journal article can be found in Brazeau et. al. 2008 in the American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education for new reviewers who would like additional instruction on the expectations of reviewers.

#### Reviewer Guidelines for The Journal

- Reviewers should review the article and consider all points on the Peer Review Evaluation Criteria Checklist. After the checklist is completed, a review should be written to the editor and your recommendations regarding publication should be given.
  - If reviewers have comments to send to the editor but would not like to share with the author, those comments should be submitted as a separate document.
- The review is double blinded to minimize bias. Reviewers should not contact the author separate from the review you are giving.
- The manuscript should be considered confidential and should not be discussed until after publication. It can be appropriate to review the manuscript drafts with a peer or in a journal club setting. The written review should include all persons involved in the review process when submitted to the editor.
- The use of generative AI tools to support peer reviews is prohibited. Reviewers are explicitly forbidden from entering confidential, embargoed, or private information into public AI tools, such as ChatGPT. Since the data entered into these tools becomes part of the repository used for content generation, the confidentiality of papers under review is compromised.
- The suggested timeline for finishing the peer review is 2 weeks.
- Reviewers should only make minimal comments in the review regarding grammar.
- For new reviewers, it is suggested to read Brazeau et. al. to review the roles and responsibilities of a reviewer.

#### Additional references for guidelines and evaluation criteria for new reviewers

1. Brazeau GA, Dipiro JT, Fincham JE, Boucher BA, and Tracy TS. Your role and responsibilities in the manuscript peer review process. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2008;72(3):69.
2. Waser NM, Price MV, and Grosberg RK. Writing an effective manuscript review. *The professional biologist.* 1992;42(8):621-623.
3. Seals DR and Tanaka H. Manuscript peer review: a helpful checklist for students and novice referees. *Adv Physiol Educ.* 2000;23(1):52-8.