



**Reviewer Resource
for the
Journal of Military and Veterans' Health**



What you need to know

Thank you for expressing an interest in being a reviewer for JMVH. Reviewers are essential to the scholarly publishing process. As a specialist in researching military and veterans' health, or an associated area, you are well placed to assess the soundness of another author's work and contribute further insights.

Reviewing for a reputable industry journal also has huge benefits for you as a reviewer:

- You will be **supporting the body of knowledge** and therefore **increasing your reputation** as a participatory academic
- You are **establishing yourself as an expert** in a given field of research
- You will interact with the **cutting-edge research** in your area, before it is published
- Exercise your **critical thinking** skills in a private arena
- You can **return the favour** to those who have reviewed your submissions
- Building a relationship with reputable journals and their editorial teams can increase your opportunity of being **invited to join an Editorial Board**

Do you have the time?

Reviewing an article can be time consuming. **Reviews are most beneficial to authors when they are thorough and specific.**

As such, it is better not to review if you don't have the time, than to take on a review and not be able to give it your full attention.

Be sure to assess your other commitments before replying to an Editor's invitation to review. You can always **recommend a colleague** who has more free time and make it clear that you would like to review in the future.

Are you a suitable reviewer?

The Editor who has approached you may not be familiar with the details of your work, but rather may only be aware of your work in a broader context. **Only accept an invitation** if you are competent to review the article.

Avoid potential conflicts of interest?

A conflict of interest will not necessarily eliminate you from reviewing an article, but full disclosure to the Editor will allow them to make an informed decision.

Examples of conflicts that should be stated when responding to an invitation to review:

- If you work in the same department or institute as one of the authors
- If you have worked on a paper previously with an author
- If you have a professional or financial connection to the article



What to consider when reviewing

There are a number of points so it is important to consider every article you review.

1. Ethics

- **Plagiarism**

If you have reason to believe that an article is a substantial copy of another work please let the Editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible.

- **Defamation/libel**

If inaccurate, unsubstantiated or emotive statements are made about organisations or people in a submitted article, please contact the Editor. If it is considered that the article could be potentially libellous, clarification will be sought from the author.

- **Fraud**

Although it can be very difficult to detect if you suspect the results in an article to be falsified please raise the matter with the Editor

- **Risk**

If the reviewer perceives there is a risk to the journal please contact the Editor about the perceived risk.

2. Confidentiality

- Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shared or discussed with others unless otherwise authorized by the Editor. Unpublished information or material disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal gain.

- Consultation with a single colleague may sometimes be appropriate but you should always discuss this with the Editor beforehand. Most Editors welcome additional comments but whoever else is involved is also obliged to keep the review process confidential. If the review is referred to a student, he or she should communicate directly with the Editor

3. Structure and content

- **See the examples** below and note how the reviewers have focused their feedback under key headings, i.e. Title, abstract, introduction, methodology, statistical errors, results/findings, discussion, and conclusion. Further, the tone and suggestions made by the reviewers are constructive and provide scope to improve the quality of the submission.

Note the constructive and non-personal nature of the feedback. It is specific and directed at improving the flow of ideas and research rigor

Example 1 of feedback:

The manuscript needs editorial review, and restructured. Some crucial information is missing to truly interpret the quality of the study; e.g. credibility and trustworthiness is not addressed. The comments below provide questions and comments to clarify a few issues. Generally speaking, the aim of the study is clearly stated, but the justification for a qualitative inquiry could have been stronger. In other words, family needs of ICU patients measured with validated questionnaire (e.g the critical care family needs inventory Q) have been the subject of many reports, but it has not been addressed specifically during inter-hospital transfer. This point would merit to be highlighted in this manuscript. Another issue that I would like to share is about the interview: wouldn't the experience of the IHT be influenced by the support the interviewees received in ICU? Would that be a potential bias to the findings of the study?

Please find below specific comments:

ABSTRACT

Replace Aim by Purpose and Results by Findings

Line 13: syntax of the sentence needs amendment

Line 21: spell IHT in full.

KEY WORDS

Do you mean rural and remote areas or care?

INTRODUCTION

P2-Line36: Is the reference number 2 the right reference?

P3-Line57-61: is this a quotation?

The philosophical framework needs to be placed in the method section under study design

METHOD

I suggest restructuring the method section as follows:

Study design, setting, participants and participants' recruitment, data collection, data analyses, and ethics.

P3-Line 68: What types of patients are admitted to this setting? A short description of family resources available would be informative (e.g. accommodation provided, etc...).

P3-Line 75: add "written" before consent. Is it appropriate to ask a staff nurse not



**Note suggestions on layout
and flow**

Example 2 of feedback:

Congratulations on a strong submission that proposes the novel application of known action learning principles to MET development. There are few grammatical suggestions / typos noted and a little more detail required for a couple of concepts.

Page 1 line 35: within the context of ('a' not 'an') MET

Page 3 line 40: enhance MET (remove 's', or add an apostrophe before it) decision making

Page 1 Introduction Seems strange to have the subtitle "Introduction" after the opening paragraphs. Would it make more sense to have a subtitle "Introduction" opening your paper and what is now called Introduction perhaps as "background" or just following on without a subheading?

Page 3 line 49 "Johnson et al., 2005 (close bracket)

Page 7, line 20 - dialogue (not dialog)

Page 4 line 56 - "...although systems are required for understanding human decisions" - this bit of the sentence feels like its tacked on at the end & is not satisfactorily explained / justified /referenced.

Page 5 line 13: perceptions of catalytic or effective, arousing stress rather than individual perceptions of distress and panic..... Here your use of "catalytic or effective" (as adjectives) doesn't make sense in this sentence... have you left a word out?

P5 line 41: "on large numbers of tasks"... do you mean while they are performing a large number of tasks during a single, predictable event, or that these key functions allow effective performance across a large number of possible tasks?

Page 6 line 15 "...through promotion of shared decision goals". So these shared decision goals - assuming these are negotiated/practiced prior to an event... at some stage you would need to talk about teams that work together regularly compared to MET teams where the makeup of the MET team can vary to some extent, (including the team leader) from day to day, and members may find themselves on a team they have never worked with before.

P6 line 39 "Additionally, Stout, Cannon-Bowers, Salas and Milanovich (1999) determined SMMs improved coordinated team performance on decision making tasks via more efficient communication during management and coordination of subtasks (see also Kozlowski & Bell, 2003)". This is a difficult sentence to read... how about something like "By improving the coordination and management of decision-making subtasks, SMMS are thought to result in more efficient team communication (Stout, Cannon-Bowers, Salas and Milanovich, 1999; Kozlowski & Bell, 2003).



Recommendations following your review

Prior to making a final recommendation on the suitability of the article it is worthwhile considering the following questions:

Originality

Does the article say something new and interesting enough to warrant publication? Does it add to the body of knowledge? Is the research question an important one? In order to determine its originality and appropriateness for the journal, it might be helpful to consider the article in the context of the wider published research. You can do this using tools such as Web of Science or Scopus. How does it compare to the most highly cited or downloaded papers in the field? If the research has been covered previously, forward any relevant references to the Editor.

Layout and format

Authors must comply fully with the journal's author guidelines, including manuscript presentation. If the author has clearly failed to adhere to these guidelines, and the Editor has not already highlighted this in the invitation to review, you should either flag this to the Editor or note this in your review. If the paper is particularly original or interesting the Editor may choose to overlook the formatting issues throughout the peer review process and ask the author to address these only shortly prior to eventual acceptance; but at other times the Editor may ask the author to restructure the paper before progressing it any further.

Title

Does it clearly describe the article? Does it include the most important keywords (consider how you search for research articles) and demonstrate the significance of the research? Does it make sense?

Structured abstract

Have all mandatory fields been completed? Does it accurately reflect the content of the article?

Introduction

Does this describe what the author hoped to achieve and clearly articulate the research question? Has the author provided a summary of the current research literature to provide context? Is it clear how this is being challenged or built upon? Are there any important works that have been omitted?

Methodology

Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected? Is the design suitable for answering the question posed? Does the article outline the procedures followed? If the methods are new, are they explained in detail? Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the equipment and materials been adequately described? Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?



Statistical errors

These are common and so close attention should be paid.

Results

This is where the author should explain clearly what was discovered in the research. Are results presented clearly? You should consider the merits and appropriateness of the author's analysis.

Discussion

The purpose of the Discussion is for the authors to state their interpretations and opinions, explain the implications of the findings, and make suggestions for future research. Its main function is to answer the questions posed in the Introduction, explain how the results support the answers and, how the answers fit in with existing knowledge on the topic. The Discussion is considered the heart of the paper.

Conclusion

A conclusion is where the author should summarize the paper's findings and generalize their importance, discuss ambiguous data, and recommend further research. An effective conclusion should provide closure for a paper, leaving the reader feeling satisfied that the concepts have been fully explained.

So you should consider are the claims in this section reasonable and supported by the results? Are the findings consistent with the author's expectations? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the author explain how the research has added to the body of knowledge?

Graphics and tables

Where these are included, please check the content and if possible make suggestions for improvements. Do the figures and tables inform the reader? Are they an important part of the story? Do the figures describe the data accurately? Are they presented consistently (e.g. in the same format throughout)?

Language

Does the quality of English make it difficult to understand the author's argument? If this is the case, you do not need to correct the English but should instead mention this as part of your review. In extreme cases where an interesting or original contribution is undermined by poor quality of expression you may bring this to the attention of the Editor who can then advise of sub-editing services

Recommendations

- Accept
- Minor Revisions
- Major Revisions
- Reject



What's the difference between "minor" and "major" revisions?

Minor revisions may more often require the author to make relatively small adjustments to the paper, the type of which that would not take too much more time. These may be to bring the paper more in line with author guidelines with a slightly reduced word count, formatting changes or the labelling of tables or figures; further evidence of an understanding of the extant research literature; or to elaborate a little more on the research findings.

Major revisions might require the author to make more significant improvements, the type of which that may take weeks or even months rather than days. Authors may be asked to address flaws in the methodology; collect more data; conduct a more thorough analysis; or even adjust the research question to ensure the paper contributes something truly original to the body of work.

For instance, your final comments to the Editor may be written as a few short sentences such as:

“Accept if the manuscript can be corrected. Overall, the methodology is sound, and the manuscript adds to the literature. If the author(s) cannot correct the manuscript, then I would reject the manuscript. As an editor I am looking for reviewer’s expertise about the manuscript submitted.”