



Peer review at IJBE

All manuscript submitted to us are scrutinized by independent experts who consider the importance, scientific potential and cost effectiveness of the research concerned.

Editorial Manager (EM)

All manuscript submission and double-blind peer review for UTCC IJBE is conducted electronically via the Editorial Manager system. Editorial Manager is web based, and all authors, reviewers and editors log in to the site to complete their assignments.

All communication regarding manuscript review will be sent to you electronically (e-mail) through the EM system.

General Principles

- Editorial review for IJBE is a double-blind process; the identities of the author and the reviewers are concealed from each other. Please call the editorial office immediately if you think you might be biased because your interests conflict with those of an author(s) or if you recognize a manuscript because you have a close personal or professional relationship with the author.
- The manuscript is a privileged communication for your personal review. You are free to solicit advice from others, but please do not refer the manuscript to anyone else to review without approval from the editors. The manuscript is the property of the author and should not be photocopied. Any printed copy of a manuscript should be destroyed by confidential means, such as shredding, once the review process is complete.
- Reviewers are selected for their varying perspectives and may well render different opinions. Decisions to publish are not based on a unanimous vote by the reviewers; the editor weighs all the evidence, including timeliness of subject and availability of space in the journal, in deciding whether a manuscript should be published.
- All reviews must be returned within 15 days. A return date will be included in your reviewer invitation. Reviewers who consistently fail to meet deadlines will not be considered for reappointment to the review panel or promotion to the editorial advisory board.
- A well-written manuscript is the author's responsibility. If a manuscript's content has potential, but the writing is awkward and of poor quality, you may want to recommend that it be returned to the author, suggesting that the author obtain professional assistance. It is neither your role nor the IJBE staff's role to rewrite poorly written manuscripts. Your recommendation regarding the potential merit of the content is all that is needed.
- Peer review is not "voting" on a manuscript. Peer review is the process through which several independent experts critique the logic, methodology, writing, and clinical utility of a manuscript and make a recommendation to the editor about the suitability of the manuscript for publication in IJBE. The individual perspectives of the reviewers help to inform and clarify the editor's own evaluation and eventual decision to request revision, accept, or reject a manuscript. When revision is requested, reviewers' comments to the author are essential to guide the author's revision.



Integrity

The integrity of double-blind peer review is of paramount importance. This means that any personal interests as a reviewer must never influence, or be seen to influence, the outcome. We consider that a conflict of interest exists where:

- The applicant is a close friend or relative
- You are directly involved in the work the applicant proposes to carry out
- You may benefit financially from the work (for example if you are involved with a company acting as a project partner)
- You work in the same research organization as the applicant(s), co-applicant(s) or project partners
- You work closely with the applicant(s) (eg. as a co-author or PhD supervisor) or have done within the last five years

If you have one of these conflicts of interest you should decline to review the proposal. This list is not exhaustive, so if you consider that you have a conflict of interest you must declare it. If you have been asked to review then you should do this by completing the Declarations of Interest section. This will allow us to decide whether your review is eligible.

Getting Started

An automatically generated e-mail message will be sent to you as a request to review. It is important that you accept the invitation as soon as possible. If you do not accept a reviewer assignment within 5 days, you will be "uninvited" by EM, and another reviewer will be assigned. Complete instructions, including your user name and password, will be included in your letter of invitation. After you accept the reviewer invitation in EM you will have access to the complete manuscript in PDF format. You may either read the manuscript on line, or download and print it. Consider the manuscript's scientific accuracy, originality, and interest to IJBE readers. Evaluate the quality of the presentation and critique both its strengths and weaknesses.

Here are suggestions that may be helpful to you.

1. Scan the title and subheadings. Read the clinical implications section.
2. Evaluate the manuscript on its merits. Use the concrete information available to you. If you do not feel capable of judging a specific portion of an article, please note that in your review and proceed with other sections. Clinicians will be asked to review research articles for their relevance and clinical utility; these manuscripts also will go to researchers for a review of the methods.
3. Read each article for accuracy of content and relevance to the specialties of obstetrics, women's health, and neonatal health care, particularly nursing practice.
4. Read the manuscript quickly without stopping to make extensive notes.
5. After re-reading the manuscript, complete the information as requested in Editorial Manager.

How to submit your review

Reviewers are chosen for their expertise in a particular field of research. Some schemes may require reviewers with different levels of expertise or particular skill sets. In certain circumstances we may ask a reviewer to consider a single aspect of a proposal, for example a particular methodological approach or one strand of a multi-faceted proposal.

If you are approached to provide a review, you will receive an email containing the details of the proposal. You will be asked to complete a review form online, which will contain various questions about the proposed work and your assessment of it. You should refer to the assessment criteria for each scheme and the guidance on how to write a good review.



What happens to your review?

- Your review is passed to the board or panel members, who will use it to inform their assessment of the manuscript. In most cases but not all* this involves a triage or shortlisting after which some proposals are rejected, followed by a meeting where the most competitive proposals are discussed and a final funding decision is made.
- Your review will be made available to the applicant. In most cases**, those applicants that pass through triage will have the opportunity to respond to all of the reviewers' comments before the board or panel meeting.
- You will be informed when a proposal you have reviewed is successful. The outcomes of all funding decisions will be published on the MRC website soon after the board or panel meeting.

Submitting Your Review in Editorial Manager

When you are ready to submit your completed review, you will log in to the EM system. You will be asked to complete a reviewer form that includes the following information. If you have extensive comments for the author or editor, we recommend that you write and save these comments in your word processing program such as MSWord. Once you are ready to submit your review, you can simply copy and paste your comments into the EM reviewer form.

Reviewer Recommendations

- Accept – if the paper is suitable for publication in its current form.
- Minor revision – if the paper will be ready for publication after light revisions. Please list the revisions you would recommend the author makes.
- Major revision – if the paper would benefit from substantial changes such as expanded data analysis, widening of the literature review, or rewriting sections of the text.
- Reject – if the paper is not suitable for publication with this journal or if the revisions that would need to be undertaken are too fundamental for the submission to continue being considered in its current form.

Reviewer Ratings

The following questions should aid you in determining your rating for each criterion. These questions are available for your reference in EM. When you are ready to submit your review simply click the "Instructions for Reviewers" link on the center of the page.

Comments to the Author

- Make your suggestions to the author in the "Comments to Author" box. Indicate possible or necessary improvements in substance, organization, logic, and style. A brief section-by-section evaluation is most helpful. For each comment, please refer to the page number and line number.
- Indicate any text that should be shortened or omitted and any figures or tables that should be deleted.
- Please make your criticisms and suggestions to the authors in a constructive and courteous manner.
- Please use your spell check and read through your critique before submitting it.
- Do not express your opinion about the overall quality and whether or not the article should be published in the comments to author. Make your recommendation about acceptability of the manuscript in your confidential remarks to the editor only.



- It is not a good use of reviewer time to rewrite sections of the manuscript or edit the text. Writing is the author's job, and professionals edit all manuscripts before publication.

Comments to the Editor

- Please write your confidential opinions in this section and, as mentioned above, your compelling reasons for your recommendation regarding the disposition of the manuscript.
- Include general suggestions and qualifications. Comments in this section are of great value to the editor in making a decision when reviewers have not reached a consensus, in writing rejection and revision letters, and in preparing accepted manuscripts for publication.

Other Guidelines

- Please notify the editorial office at your earliest convenience of changes in your address, telephone number, fax number, email address.
- Changes in your personal information can be made directly in the Editorial Manager system.
- Reviewers are the cornerstones of any peer-reviewed journal. Your work is extremely important to IJBE. If you have questions or suggestions, please call IJBE staff or a member of the editorial advisory board.

Roles and Responsibilities

Responsibilities:

- Thoroughly and critically evaluates manuscripts submitted to IJBE.
- Controls personal biases while reviewing articles.
- Recommends articles for acceptance, revision or rejection.
- Provides authors with constructive criticism and specific for revision.
- Meets deadlines as requested IJBE editorial staff.