

REVIEWER EXPECTATIONS

Peer review is an integral part of publishing original research and reviews of the literature 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

Accepting a Peer Review

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, Kate Rotzenberg (editor@pswi.org), or the Peer Review Coordinator as soon as possible. A novice 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 three weeks. If a reviewer feels they will not be able to meet the deadline for any reason, the reviewer may ask the editor for a short extension otherwise the review should be declined in a timely manner so a different reviewer can be assigned.

Conducting a Peer Review

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 If any reviewer, including those in a journal club setting, is found to discuss an unpublished manuscript outside of the peer-review process, they will no longer be asked to participate in article reviews for *The Journal*.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 anonymized to minimize bias in publication recommendations. In most situations, there will be two separate reviewers per article. Reviewers should not attempt to directly contact the author 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. Written comments are the most important part of the review; these may be included within the checklist and/or as a separate document (e.g., in-text comments in the manuscript or a separate narrative document). Comments should be detailed and include clear opinions regarding the strengths, weaknesses, relevance, and importance to the field. Specific comments that cite manuscript sections, pages, paragraphs, and line numbers are most helpful. Reviewers should consider themselves as mentors of the author(s). Comments should be constructive in nature and suggestions should be offered to enhance the quality of the manuscript. Reviewers should consider framing comments as if they were giving feedback to a close colleague. 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; however, reviewers may provide feedback on how to best interpret results obtained from less than ideal methods and addressing the limitations of those methods appropriately.

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 should assess to what degree the author has drawn appropriate conclusions from the data and/or literature they analyzed. 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.

Making a Recommendation

Once the evaluation checklist is completed, reviewers are expected to submit a recommendation regarding publication of the manuscript as follows:

- **Accept in Present Form:** This paper contributes to the literature and should be published. Minor issues are limited to grammar, syntax, or formatting which can be corrected without author involvement.
- **Accept after Minor Revisions:** There are minor issues with the paper that require the author to address prior to publication (such as reference issues or moving paragraphs). A second peer review is not necessary to confirm the issues have been appropriately addressed.

- **Reconsider after Major Revisions:** There are substantive issues with the paper that require considerable work on the part of the author to examine and address. The paper will likely require another round of peer review after resubmission.
- **Reject:** The paper should not be published. Reasons for rejection may include writing quality that is so poor it is impossible to evaluate the paper, inappropriate methods, poor execution of study design, or lack of relevance of the results.

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.