

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

Chapter 1 : Database of Scientific Journals

Review: Now in a revised and updated third edition, The Peer-Reviewed Journal "A Comprehensive Guide through the Editorial Process is a practical and informative "how to" guide written specifically to help novice editors-in-chief, managing editors, and editorial office support staff to set up effective and efficient procedures for managing.

Methodological principles have been formulated to guide their development. Mean overall adherence to standards by each guideline was Mean SD adherence to methodological standards on guideline development and format was Mean adherence to standards by each guideline improved from However, there was little improvement over time in adherence to standards on identification and summary of evidence from While all areas of guideline development need improvement, greatest improvement is needed in the identification, evaluation, and synthesis of the scientific evidence. Clinical practice guidelines are commonly defined as "systematically developed statements to assist practitioner and patient decisions about appropriate health care for specific clinical circumstances. Methods Instrument Development Using the principles formulated by the major medical organizations mentioned, a group of experts in guidelines and evidence-based medicine identified key elements for the development and reporting of guidelines. Feedback was also solicited at 3 national workshops about practice guidelines. Based on the careful, comprehensive, and inclusive development process used, we felt that these criteria were a valid representation of current standards for guidelines. We developed a item instrument, using a yes or no format, to measure adherence to these elements, broadly grouped into standards on guideline format and development 10 items , identification and summary of evidence 10 items , and formulation of recommendations 5 items. Questions were refined for clarity through multiple rounds of pretesting by the authors on 35 published guidelines. To further confirm content validity, we surveyed 13 experts who have published articles on guideline methodology and a random sample of persons responsible for guideline development for 12 major medical organizations to independently evaluate the validity of our instrument as a measure of the methodological quality of guidelines. The median rating of validity on a scale of 1 to 5 1 representing poor validity and 5 excellent validity by both the experts and developers was a 4 range, 3. Finally, to determine if the instrument could differentiate well-developed from poorly developed guidelines, we asked 6 persons formally trained in critical appraisal skills to rank 6 guidelines in order of quality based on accepted principles of guideline development. Thus, overall, we feel our instrument is a valid measure of the methodological quality of guidelines. Names of medical organizations and government agencies involved in practice guideline activity were also included as search terms. The AMA Directory of Practice Parameters, 16 as well as the bibliographies of guidelines, editorials, review articles, and other articles about guidelines, were searched for additional published guidelines. Retrieved documents were considered guidelines if they met the definition of a guideline as proposed by the IOM. Since few guidelines were published prior to and because of the large number of guidelines published overall, we evaluated only guidelines published in peer-reviewed journals in odd-numbered years from through June 30, In addition, we retrieved and evaluated any background supporting articles cited as part of the guideline if available in peer-reviewed journals. Each guideline was independently evaluated by 2 investigators for adherence to methodological standards. Statistical Analysis The total number of standards satisfied by each individual guideline could range from 0 to The mean SD number of standards satisfied was calculated collectively and for each individual year. In addition, the frequency of adherence to each of the 25 standards was calculated. We evaluated time trends of adherence to methodological standards by constructing multiple crude linear regression models with "year" as the independent variable 1df. Guideline developers were divided into 4 groups: The mean number of standards satisfied by guidelines produced by each of these groups was compared by 1-way analysis of variance. Finally, we tested for the effect of prior experience producing guidelines and length of the guideline document on adherence to methodological standards by constructing multiple linear regression models. In these models, the independent variable was used in a continuous fashion

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

with 1 df. The level of statistical significance was established at a 2-sided P value of less than. All analyses were performed using the Statistical Analysis System, version 6. Results We evaluated guidelines covering a wide range of topics. A bibliographic list of evaluated guidelines is available from the authors on request. Overall, the mean SD number of standards satisfied out of 25 was Guidelines did show significant improvement from 9. Fewer than half described the patient population to which the guideline applied, while slightly greater than half described the intended audience of the guideline. The methodological standards on the identification and summary of evidence were poorly adhered to, with an overall mean adherence of Few guidelines specified the methods used to identify scientific evidence Surprisingly few guidelines 7. Even though guidelines have been championed as a means to decrease health care expenditures, only Guidelines did better in specifying the benefits and harms expected to result from specific health practices Moreover, few guidelines However, all guidelines made specific recommendations for practice, and most Guidelines significantly improved in their mean adherence to standards on guideline development and format, from However, the mean adherence to standards on evidence evaluation changed little, from The mean number of standards satisfied by guidelines produced by the 3 major groups did not differ significantly The median number of guidelines identified for each of the 69 guideline developers was 9 interquartile range, The mean SD length of the guidelines in our study was 9. For example, the mean number of standards satisfied by guidelines fewer than 4 pages long was 7.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

Chapter 2 : Journal of Management Science & Engineering research

These keywords were added by machine and not by the authors. This process is experimental and the keywords may be updated as the learning algorithm improves.

Scientific Journals represent the collaborative efforts of many scientists and scholars from various disciplines. Science literatures have evolved from time to time in terms of specialization and target audience. Reports of new research findings are important to fuel novel assumptions and discoveries that can only be in existence through the publication of Science journals. Although some Science Journals are multidisciplinary, most journals are highly specialized and they publish articles related to specific scientific fields. In an attempt to maintain quality and ensure validity of the research being published, Science Journals subject the articles through a rigorous peer-review process, honoring copyrights. Science Journals may include various types of articles such as, letters, short communications, review articles, research articles, case reports, editorials, and other supplementary articles. The rules and guidelines of article writing as well as formatting may vary with the type of the journal and the publisher. Majority scholarly journals are science journals as they follow systematic way of writing, away from the subjective references and bias. Since Sciences can be defined as systematic body of knowledge that remains neutral universally and can be proved with evidences in the laboratories. They withstand the test of the time and accept challenges. Science journals hence, consider articles that are written based on certain empirical evidences that are obtained as a result of laboratory testing or clinical investigations. All Science Journals need to be very specific in terms of publishing original, peer-reviewed , and high quality research works. In order to gain new insights into the field of science and benefit from the ongoing research activities, it is absolutely imperative that all research publications in Science must be made available online, preferably through Open Access system. This will allow the science community to be more updated with new developments in the field of science and consequently, expedite the process of resolving both existing and newly emerging issues. Availability of paid online scientific journals is out of the reach of young and intellectual scientists who cannot afford to access the data they require, thereby impeding the improvement of research. Open Access Science Journals provide an unlimited, free access to the researched, scientific information to scholars, researchers, students and professionals, which enable them to copy, print, circulate innumerable number of copies at no cost. Scholarly Open Access Journals are boon to the promotion of scientific research of any discipline. Science Journals, also called scholarly Academic Journals, are a forum for the scientists, researchers and academicians where they can take their original research work and discuss it critically. All the scholarly publications follow peer review process in selecting research publications where the scholars and experts in the field evaluate the research work presented and certify whether it is written as per the research norms. Researchers, academicians and experts of a particular discipline contribute their works for the Scholarly Journals. All the articles published in the academic science journals are scholarly journals articles written following a specific style. They are written following a well established research methodology and research framework. Academic journals also encourage original work. They are obviously highly analytical and descriptive with certain documental evidences like charts, figures, graphs and diagrams. It expects authors to duly acknowledge the sources of information and safeguard the copyrights.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

Chapter 3 : Editorial Policy

At peer-reviewed journals, decision-making authority rests solely with journal editors or the journal's editorial board. Indeed, it is the journal editor who is considered to be central to the decision making process. 1.

At some point in your academic career you will probably be asked to locate and use a scholarly or academic resource. As an academic library, Meriam Library collects mostly scholarly resources. What does this mean? Scholarly resources have the following features: They are written for other experts or people in academia. They use scholarly language with technical, discipline specific vocabulary. They provide verifiable and reliable evidence for claims. They may be peer reviewed. Many journals go through an editorial process where other experts review and assess the information. How do you know if a journal is peer reviewed? Some databases will let you check a box to limit to peer reviewed articles. Z U5 vol. Scholarly articles are published in scholarly journals. Most of these journals are discipline specific. Scholarly articles have certain things in common. Sometimes you will encounter popular resources. Not only will you need to learn how to differentiate scholarly and popular resources but you will need to know when it is appropriate to use a popular resource. Here is some information about popular resources: Features of popular resources such as magazines: Written for general audiences most likely by non-experts such as journalists Easy to locate and purchase Catchy headlines and titles Articles tend to be short Lots of color images and advertisements Little or no reference to where the information was obtained Examples: Click the image or use the below PDF for more information.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

Chapter 4 : What Types of References Are Appropriate?

Peer Reviewed Journals Share this page Peer review is the essential part for maintaining substantial standard in publishing and brings out the best possible scientific novel information from the potential authors and researchers globally.

Peer review process and editorial decision making at journals Series: Part02 - Status descriptions in journal submission systems Key takeaways: Peer review is the process by which journals scrutinize and regulate the quality of content they publish, by inviting experts in the field to review and comment on manuscripts received. Manuscripts submitted to a journal first go through an initial screening by the editorial team. Those that clear the screening are sent to at least two experts for peer review. Peer reviewers independently make a recommendation to the journal editor as to whether the manuscript should be rejected or accepted with or without revisions. The journal editor considers all the feedback from peer reviewers and makes an informed decision to accept or reject the manuscript. Editage Insights Nov 04, It is a process by which experts evaluate scholarly works, and its objective is to ensure a high quality of published science. However, peer reviewers do not make the decision to accept or reject papers. At most, they recommend a decision. Indeed, it is the journal editor who is considered to be central to the decision making process. Only after clearing the initial screening is the manuscript sent to one or more peer reviewers. Initial screening Approximately 3 million manuscripts are submitted to journals every year. During the initial screening, journal editors mainly check the following: Journal editors typically look at hundreds of manuscripts a year. One of the first items that editors will look at is the cover letter, and they may not get further than the cover letter if the study does not seem interesting enough. Therefore, it is imperative that authors craft a well-written cover letter that highlights the significance and strength of their research as well as provides a good reason why the manuscript is a good fit for the journal. Editors will then go through the abstract and may even skim through the introduction, figures and tables, or other sections of the paper to determine whether the manuscript passes their quality threshold. Benefits of initial screening: If the manuscript clearly lies outside the scope of the journal, then a rapid rejection allows the author to quickly find and submit their manuscript to another journal. There are three common types of peer review for journal publication: Names of authors and reviewers are revealed to each other Generally, a minimum of 2 peer reviewers up to 6 are chosen for the peer review. Peer reviewers are ideally experts in their field. Journals usually build a pool of peer reviewers that have a good track record of producing high-quality reviews. Or they may scan the bibliography to identify potential reviewers or contact researchers they met at conferences and seminars. Editors have to be careful to select reviewers who have sufficient subject matter expertise to do justice to the manuscript. Therefore, highly technical papers or papers from niche subject areas may take longer to review, because it may take editors some time to locate appropriate reviewers. Some journals give authors the option of recommending preferred and non-preferred reviewers. Authors would do well to take advantage of this option if available as it can expedite the review process, since it saves the journal time in looking for reviewers. Furthermore, studies have found that author recommended peer reviewers tend to recommend acceptance more often than journal recommended reviewers. Typically, journals ask reviewers to complete their reviews within weeks. Ask a Question Final decision The journal editor or editorial board considers the feedback provided by the peer reviewers and arrives at a decision. The following are the most common decisions that are made: The second decision accept with minor revisions is typically the best outcome authors should hope for. Once a journal rejects a paper outright, authors are well advised not to resubmit to the same journal. If the journal wanted to reconsider the paper, they would have issued a conditional rejection. An outright rejection means that the journal thinks the paper will not meet its publication standards or interests even after heavy revisions. In reality, reviewers tend to recommend acceptance more often than rejection.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

Chapter 5 : Peer review and the publication process

Peer-reviewed journal articles go through a checking or verification process before they are published. Other experts in the same field of study as that of the article, examine the article's content to make sure it is valid and correct before the article is published.

Consists primarily of consensus medical opinion. Plain Language Policy A. The information is designed to be easily accessible, visually pleasing, and informative. We strive for a 5th to 7th grade reading level, logical organization, short sentences and common everyday words, and design features that make the content easy to read, understand, and use. Some of our more in-depth content is written at a higher reading level for readers who wish to pursue a more advanced study of health topics. Medical Review Board A. Review content in their specialty areas Ensure content is up-to-date with the most recent treatment guidelines and practices, important studies, breakthrough drugs, and drug warnings Help the A. Editorial Team perform consistency checks across products Physicians on the A. Medical Review Board are affiliated with leading institutions across the country, including top hospitals as ranked by U. News and World Report. Physicians are chosen to review or write medical content only in the clinical areas in which they have been formally trained and actively practice. They are board certified for that specialty, where applicable. Members of the A. Medical Review Board are listed below. Allergy and Immunology Stuart I. Emergency Medicine Jacob L. Infectious Disease Jatin M. Internal Medicine Laura J. Nurse Practitioner Jennifer K. Surgery, General Debra G. VeriMed Healthcare Network A. VeriMed is a comprehensive group of over practicing, board-certified physician writers and educators representing all medical subspecialties. VeriMed doctors are affiliated with leading institutions across the country, including the top hospitals as ranked by U. VeriMed physicians are chosen to review or write medical content only in the clinical areas in which they have been formally trained and actively practice. They are board certified or board eligible for that specialty, where applicable. Some of these physician reviewers are listed below. General Surgery Mary C. Orthopedic Surgery Thomas N. Review provided by VeriMed Healthcare Network. All new and updated articles are then reviewed and approved by a member of our medical review board with expertise in the subject area. Internal personnel have a minimum of 5 years of experience writing and editing health content. Articles reviewed by this team of professionals are referenced using "A. Members of this team are listed below. Prior to joining A. Zieve served as editor and product manager at Milliman Care Guidelines. Milliman is considered the industry standard for independently developed and produced evidence-based clinical guidelines used in a variety of web-based case management applications in hospitals, insurance companies, and case management agencies. Brenda Conaway, Editorial Director With over 20 years of experience producing medical content for a range of audiences, Brenda Conaway has an extensive background in Consumer Health. For the past three years, Brenda has played a pivotal role in the development of new content and products, using her experience to improve existing A. AM products and making sure that our products are evidence-based. In her role as Editorial Director for A. M, Brenda oversees strategic content development and overall editorial operations, ensuring that all A. Before that, she was Senior Editorial Manager at StayWell, where she managed the editorial department, overseeing the production of more than 60 custom publications and producing award-winning content for both consumers and health care providers. Theodora Szasz, MD, PhD, Managing Editor Theodora Szasz has broad expertise in medical writing and biomedical science after more than 15 years combined experience in research and clinical practice. Prior to joining the A. Internal editorial team A. Some members of the writing team have clinical backgrounds. Their work is carefully scrutinized for medical accuracy, adherence to our centrist editorial voice, and patient and consumer friendliness. Editors receive ongoing evaluation, feedback, and encouragement from staff physicians and senior editors at A. Medical Illustration Team Our team of physicians also reviews all illustrations, animations, and supporting text. Johnson has played key roles in product development since Dan has been instrumental in creating the look and feel of A. His expertise has

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

enabled A. User Feedback Mechanism User feedback is important to us. All comments are read by our Senior Editorial staff and assessed for importance. If comments indicate a serious issue with an article, a full medical review can be triggered and the feedback is given to the physician to use while reviewing the article. If a comment relates to medical accuracy, any changes made are based on a physician review of the comment. Smaller issues such as typos and broken links are fixed as soon as possible. Suggestions for new articles, images, and animations are always appreciated. To give us some feedback please send an email to Consumer Health Support, using the email form located at located at: If a response is requested, we will make every attempt to contact the commenter within three 3 business days. The content is displayed in HTML, and consists primarily of text, images, or animation content. Browser plug-ins are required to view some content types, and can be downloaded free from various third party websites. One of the most useful technologies for enabling website access for the visually impaired is the Alternate tag ALT tag standard, supported by HTML and most browsers. With a text reader, a visually impaired user can get an audio description of the ALT-tagged image or link, thus providing the end user the ability to navigate a site. Third Party Content A. This content may or may not contain all information normally included in our articles, such as the specific reviewer name. Availability of reviewer information is one of the criterion by which we judge third party content. As vendors are found and reviewed, A. Health Management Tools A. Information in these tools is written in plain language and is drawn from the medical evidence and major clinical guidelines as documented in the references section. References are provided for each individual tool. All tools are reviewed and approved by two people every 2 years, including a physician. These regulations govern issues such as acceptance or denial of advertisements and or sponsorship by A. This policy may be modified at any time using A. If a modification occurs, A. Clients who license our content may place advertising on the individual content pages, and may use words, design, or placement to differentiate this from their A. The client has the ability to decide how to differentiate between A. All content found on our website or licensed to our clients has been created by, provided by, or influenced by either A. Vendors must also have safeguards against editorial conflicts of interest. All physicians must also disclose any conflict-of-interest affiliations when they agree to an assignment. If conflict of interest is determined, the physician will be reassigned or steps will be taken to rectify the situation. Conflict-of-interest affiliations can include: Research support including grants, salaries, equipment, supplies, and other expenses by organizations, pharmaceutical companies, or medical device companies that may gain or lose financially through their work as a consumer health reviewer. Recent or current engagement in a research project or anticipated employment by any organization, pharmaceutical company, or medical device company that may gain or lose financially through their work as a consumer health reviewer. Stocks, shares, consultation fees, or other forms of payment from any organization, pharmaceutical company, or medical device company that may gain or lose financially through their work as a consumer health reviewer; and patents or patent applications that may be affected by their work as a consumer health reviewer. Disclosures must be made to the appropriate manager, director, or vice president at hiring or when said interest develops. Supervisors will review with company officers to decide if there is a conflict of interest. If conflict of interest is determined, the staff member will be reassigned or steps will be taken to rectify the situation. Our review partner, VeriMed, asks their professionals about potential conflicts of interest and discloses any potential conflicts of interest to A. To date, no reviewers have had any conflicts of interest. In these instances, the content does not, nor will it ever, contain any mention of URAC or display the seal. Autonomy of Editorial Department All A. Editorial and Visual Production staff members must disclose conflict-of-interest affiliations with any organization, pharmaceutical company, or medical device company. Disclosures must be made to the appropriate manager, director, or vice president at hiring or when such an interest develops. Supervisors review with company officers to decide if a conflict of interest does exist. If conflict of interest is determined, the staff member is reassigned or steps are taken to rectify the situation. All Medical Review Board physicians working on an A. If conflict of interest is determined, the physician is reassigned or steps are taken to rectify the situation. Our review partner, VeriMed Healthcare Network, asks

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

their professionals about potential conflicts of interest and discloses any potential conflicts of interest to A.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

Chapter 6 : Peer Review Process and Peer Reviewed Publications

The process is a "black box" - journals and mentors alike generally provide few insights into the workings of the peer review process or into the reasoning of the reviewers. A young researcher's first experience as a reviewer is often just as haphazard: he or she is.

What Types of References Are Appropriate? When writing a research paper, there are many different types of sources that you might consider citing. Which are less appropriate? Here we discuss the different types of sources that you may wish to use when working on a research paper. Please note that the following represents a general set of recommended guidelines that is not specific to any class and does not represent department policy. The types of allowable sources may vary by course and instructor. Peer-reviewed journal articles are research papers that have been accepted for publication after having undergone a rigorous editorial review process. During that review process, the article was carefully evaluated by at least one journal editor and a group of reviewers usually scientists that are experts in the field or topic under investigation. Often the article underwent revisions before it was judged to be satisfactory for publication. Most articles submitted to high quality journals are not accepted for publication. As such, research that is successfully published in a respected peer-reviewed journal is generally regarded as higher quality than research that is not published or is published elsewhere, such as in a book, magazine, or on a website. However, just because a study was published in a peer-reviewed journal does not mean that it is free from error or that its conclusions are correct. Accordingly, it is important to critically read and carefully evaluate all sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles.

Tips for finding and using peer-reviewed journal articles: Other search engines, such as Google Scholar, typically include both peer-reviewed and not peer-reviewed articles in search results, and thus should be used with greater caution. Even though a peer-reviewed journal article is, by definition, a source that has been carefully vetted through an editorial process, it should still be critically evaluated by the reader. When relying on such sources, it is important to carefully consider its accuracy and trustworthiness. For example, books vary in quality; most have not undergone any form of review process other than basic copyediting. However, there are books that have been edited prior to publication, as is the case with many reputable encyclopedias; also, many books from academic publishers are comprised of multiple chapters, each written by one or more researchers, with the entire volume carefully reviewed by one or more editors. In those cases, the book has undergone a form of peer review, albeit often not as rigorous as that for a peer-reviewed journal article.

Tips for using books, encyclopedias, and other scholarly works: When using books, encyclopedias, and other scholarly works that is, works written or produced by researchers, official agencies, or corporations, it is important to very carefully evaluate the quality of that source. If the source is an edited volume in which case in the editor's will be listed on the cover, is published by a reputable source such as Academic Press, MIT Press, and others, or is written by a major expert in the field such as a researcher with a track record of peer-reviewed journal articles on the subject, then it is more likely to be trustworthy. It is best to ask the instructor for clarification. However, for many topics it is possible to find a plethora of sources that have not been peer-reviewed but also discuss the topic. These may include articles in popular magazines or postings in blogs, forums, and other websites. In general, although these sources may be well-written and easy to understand, their scientific value is often not as high as that of peer-reviewed articles. Exceptions include some magazine and newspaper articles that might be cited in a research paper to make a point about public awareness of a given topic, to illustrate beliefs and attitudes about a given topic among journalists, or to refer to a news event that is relevant to a given topic.

Tips for using magazines, blogs, and websites: Avoid such references if possible. You should primarily focus on peer-reviewed journal articles as sources for your research paper. High quality research papers typically do not rely on non-academic and not peer-reviewed sources. Refer to non-academic, not peer-reviewed sources sparingly, and if you do, be sure to carefully evaluate the accuracy and scientific merit of the source.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE THROUGH THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

Chapter 7 : Peer Reviewed Journals List | Open Access OMICS Journals List

The peer review process is one of the cornerstones of academic writing, and is a way of ensuring that the information in any academic publication is verifiable and of a good quality.

Anali Perry, a librarian from Arizona State University Libraries, gives a quick definition of a peer-reviewed article. This 3 minute video from the Peabody Library at Vanderbilt University talks about the differences between popular and scholarly articles. It also mentions trade publications. [Link to video What Is Peer Review?](#) In academic publishing, the goal of peer review is to assess the quality of articles submitted for publication in a scholarly journal. Before an article is deemed appropriate to be published in a peer-reviewed journal, it must undergo the following process: The author of the article must submit it to the journal editor who forwards the article to experts in the field. These impartial reviewers are charged with carefully evaluating the quality of the submitted manuscript. The peer reviewers check the manuscript for accuracy and assess the validity of the research methodology and procedures. If appropriate, they suggest revisions. If they find the article lacking in scholarly validity and rigor, they reject it. **Features of a Peer-Reviewed Article** When you are determining whether or not the article you found is a peer-reviewed article, you should consider the following questions: Is the journal in which you found the article published or sponsored by a professional scholarly society, professional association, or university academic department? Does it describe itself as a peer-reviewed publication? Read the database description to see if it includes scholarly publications. Did you limit your search to scholarly or peer-reviewed publications? Is there an abstract summary at the beginning of the article? Is the tone of the article thoughtful, restrained and serious? Does the article have footnotes or citations of other sources? Does the article have a bibliography or list of references at the end? Is the topic of the article narrowly focused and explored in depth? Is the article based on either original research or authorities in the field as opposed to personal opinion? Is the article written for readers with some prior knowledge of the subject? If your field is social or natural science, is the article divided into sections with headings such as those listed below?

Chapter 8 : Print + Electronic Planning Journals - Planning - LibGuides at Dalhousie University

Aims. To provide an overview of the peer review process, its various types, selection of peer reviewers, the purpose and significance of the peer review with regard to the assessment and management of quality of publications in academic journals.

Chapter 9 : Peer Review and Editorial Decision Making Process at Publishing Journals

Elsevier Publishing Campus. The Elsevier Publishing Campus is a free online platform that provides lectures, interactive training and professional advice on a wide range of topics, from the fundamentals of publishing to broader issues like gender in research and open science.