

**Guide for reviewers of papers submitted to International Journal
of Advanced Joint Reconstruction (Editorial)**

Author

Fernández-Valencia, JA, Weinrauch, Patrick, Ballesteros, J

Published

2018

Journal Title

International Journal of Advanced Joint Reconstruction

Version

Version of Record (VoR)

Rights statement

© 2018 Fernández-Valencia JA et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (CC-BY-NC), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/391601>

Link to published version

<http://www.healthyjoints.eu/IJAJR/guide-for-reviewers-of-papers-submitted-to-international-journal-of-advanced-joint-reconstruction/>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

Guide for reviewers of papers submitted to International Journal of Advanced Joint Reconstruction.

Fernández-Valencia JA^{1,2}, Weinrauch PCL^{3,4}, Ballesteros J^{1,2}.

1 Department of Orthopaedic Surgery and Traumatology. Hospital Clinic. University of Barcelona. Spain.

2 Instituto de Cirugía Ortopédica Avanzada. Clínica Sagrada Familia. Barcelona. Spain.

3 Brisbane Hip Clinic. Brisbane. Queensland, Australia.

4 School of Medicine, Gold Coast Campus, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia.

Abstract

We provide a guide for reviewers contributing to the peer-review of the journal, based on previously published recommendations and also in our experience as editors.

Keywords

Peer review; journal publishing; journal editorial; editor.



The value of any scientific journal largely relies on the work of the reviewers. At the time of the review, they will use their experience to decide what to do: to accept or reject. The decision will be argued based on aspects such as the scope of the article, its methodology, or the adequacy of conclusions.

Some journals provide guides for reviewers, some other don't. During the development of the International Journal of Advanced Joint Reconstruction, we have observed very different approaches in the realization of the peer-review and we consider it desirable to standardize the analysis of each work that is submitted to our journal. In this way we aim to provide a structured guidance for the analysis, and thus to achieve a balance between peer reviews, both profitable for authors and for the Journal.

We have performed our recommendations based on recommendations previously published (1-5), as well as on our experience. The guide has been divided into the following sections: general considerations, abstract and keywords, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion and references. At the end, the reviewer should indicate whether the article can be accepted without changes (rare), accepted with minor revisions, accepted with major revisions or rejected.

The conclusions have been drafted in this editorial in the following page as figure 1, but will also be available on the website separately.

As editors of the journal we hope that the guide, aimed as a check-list, will be useful.

References

1. Zimmerman E. How to Write a Scientific Peer Review: A Guide for the New Reviewer. Canadian Science Publishing. Accessed on <http://www.cdnsiencepub.com/blog/how-to-write-a-scientific-peer-review-a-guide-for-the-new-reviewer.aspx> Date: 01/12/2017.
2. Garfield JM, Kaye AD, Kolinsky DC, Urman RD. A systematic guide for peer reviewers for a medical journal. *J Med Pract Manage.* 2015;30(6 Spec No): 13-7.
3. Provenzale JM, Stanley RJ. A systematic guide to reviewing a manuscript. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2005;185(4):848-54.
4. Roberts LW, Coverdale J, Edenharder K, Louie A. How to review a manuscript: a "down-to-earth" approach. *Acad Psychiatry* 2004; 28:81-87.

GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

General considerations

- Does the article provide a worthwhile scientific or clinical contribution?
- Has the appropriate structure?
- Have the authors declared any potential conflicting interests relating to research? If required, has appropriate Research Ethics Board approvals been obtained and declared?
- If needed, write concisely and precisely which changes you recommend.
- List separately suggested changes in style, grammar and other small changes

Abstract and Keywords

- Is it too long?
- Does it reflect the study clearly?
- Does it include key findings and provides data?
- Are Keywords adequately selected?

Introduction

- Does it adequately introduce and put the study into perspective?
- Are the background literature and study rationale clearly articulated?
- Are all citations well selected and necessary?

Methodology

- Could the methodology answer their research question?
- Are the methods explained so that other colleagues could clearly reproduce the research?
- Should the authors have included additional material to further explain the methodology?

Results, tables and figures

- Are the results well organized, with logical order?
- Any improvements in the way data is shown?
- Are the figures, tables or schemes clear and present relevant, non redundant data?
- Are there too many figures? (A maximum of 3 figures is recommended).
- Assess completeness of legends, headers and axis labels.

Discussion

- Does the Discussion place the findings in appropriate context regarding previous studies?
- Comment on justification of interpretations and conclusions.
- Are there any redundancies or limitations of the findings?

Conclusion

- Does the conclusion reflect the result of the main research question of this study?
- Comment on importance, validity and generality of conclusions
- Request toning down of unjustified claims and generalizations

References

- Check accuracy, number and citation appropriateness.

www.healthyjoints.eu/IJAJR

Checklist from the article: Fernández-Valencia JA, Weinrauch PCL, Ballesteros J. Guide for reviewers of papers submitted to International Journal of Advanced Joint Reconstruction. Int J Adv Jt Reconstr. 2018; 5(1):1-3.

Fig.1 Proposed reviewers check-list

Copyright

Copyright © 2018 Fernández-Valencia JA et al. This is an open access article distributed under the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Conflicts of interest statement

The authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organisation or entity with any financial interest, or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Correspondence

Jenaro Fernández-Valencia, MD, PhD.

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery and Traumatology

Hospital Clínic. University of Barcelona. Spain.

C/ Villarroel 170. Barcelona 08036. Spain.

How to cite

Fernández-Valencia JA, Weinrauch PCL, Ballesteros J. Guide for reviewers of papers submitted to International Journal of Advanced Joint Reconstruction. Int J Adv Jt Reconstr. 2018; 5(1):1-3.