CLINICAL JOURNAL FOR NURSE PRACTITIONERS IN WOMEN'S HEALTH

The Official Journal of the National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health

Peer Reviewer Role, Qualifications, and Responsibilities

Peer reviewers for *Clinical Journal for Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health* (CJNPWH) assist the editor in chief in ensuring that journal content is credible, high quality, and relevant to our readers. Peer reviewers are selected by the editor in chief based on qualifications and ability to meet the outlined responsibilities.

Peer reviewer qualifications include being:

- An active member of NPWH
- A board-certified nurse practitioner or nurse-midwife
- Currently employed in practice, academe, research, or policy with a focus on women's or gender-related health
- Highly knowledgeable in one or more areas of women's and gender-related health or non-gyn primary care

Peer reviewer responsibilities include:

- Peer reviewing 2-3 manuscripts each year as needed
- Notifying the editor immediately if unable to review a manuscript in a timely manner (generally we allow 2-3 weeks for reviews)
- Notifying the editor if your knowledge of the manuscript topic is not adequate to allow for a reliable assessment (expertise in every aspect of the topic is not required)
- Notifying the editor of any potential personal or financial conflict of interest and declining review when a possibility of a conflict exists
- Complying with the editor's written instructions on expectations for the scope, content, and quality of a review
- Indicating whether the writing is clear, concise, relevant, accurate, and of interest to journal readers
- Reviewing the manuscript reference list to determine if references are current and appropriate to the content, and making suggestions for any specific references that should be used
- Reporting to the editor any recognized ethical concerns with the manuscript (eg, plagiarism, fabricated data, substantial similarity between the reviewed manuscript and an article published in another journal known to reviewer)
- Providing thoughtful, unbiased, constructive feedback as needed for the author with a documented basis for opinions

- Recommending acceptance as is, acceptance with minor revision, need for major revision, or rejection of the reviewed manuscript – all final decisions are made by the editor in chief
- Maintaining the confidentiality of the review process
- Recommending new peer reviewers

Updated 1/2/25