

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

We want you to be fully informed and supported as a JRIPE reviewer, so that you can contribute a rigorous and valuable review to our journal. Therefore, we provide the following resources, organized into three parts:

1. An overview of the roles and responsibilities of reviewers, inspired by guidelines published by the [Council of Science Editors](#);
2. A step-by-step guide for conducting a review, inspired by [Wiley Author Services](#);
3. Guidelines addressing the use of artificial intelligence, inspired by [Springer](#).

Reviewer Roles and Responsibilities

Peer review is the central mechanism through which scholarly research is evaluated and validated, playing a key role in decisions about research funding, publication, and academic advancement. As the volume of scientific publishing continues to increase, the rigor of a journal's peer-review process and the expertise of its editorial leadership remain important indicators of credibility and reputation. Journals that publish peer-reviewed research rely on reviewers with relevant disciplinary or methodological expertise to assess manuscript quality. Typically, each submission is evaluated by at least two independent reviewers, though some manuscripts may require additional assessments. For example, a paper involving complex statistical analyses may warrant review by a statistical expert. When reviewer opinions diverge substantially or controversies arise regarding a manuscript's merits, editors may seek further evaluations or contribute their own judgment to the decision-making process. In some cases, reviewers from multiple disciplines are needed to ensure a balanced and comprehensive assessment. Given this role, reviewers carry significant responsibilities not only toward editors and journals, but also toward authors and the broader scholarly community.

Reviewer responsibilities toward authors

- Provide constructive, fair, and impartial feedback on the scholarly merits and significance of the manuscript within an appropriate timeframe, clearly explaining the rationale underlying the evaluation.
- Assess whether the manuscript communicates its ideas clearly and effectively, including the quality of the writing, the accuracy of the scientific content, the originality of the contribution, and its likely relevance to the journal's readership.
- Refrain from personal criticism or inappropriate commentary directed at the authors.
- Respect the confidentiality of the peer-review process by not sharing, discussing, or disclosing any aspect of the manuscript or its contents with individuals outside the review process.

Reviewer responsibilities toward editors

- Inform the editors promptly if it is not feasible to complete the review within the requested timeframe and, where appropriate, suggest alternative qualified reviewers.
- Disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest that could compromise impartiality, and decline to conduct the review when such conflicts exist.
- Adhere to the journal's review guidelines and editorial instructions so that the evaluation aligns with the journal's expectations for scope, quality, and process.
- Provide a thorough, constructive, and evidence-based assessment of the manuscript's scholarly contribution, including its scientific merit, originality, scope, and overall quality, along with suggestions for improvement where relevant.

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

- Offer a recommendation regarding publication (e.g., acceptance, revision, or rejection) when requested by the editor.
- Alert the editor to any ethical concerns identified in the manuscript, including possible breaches involving research with human or animal subjects, plagiarism, duplicate publication, or known simultaneous submission to another journal.
- Refrain from contacting the authors directly outside the formal editorial review process.

Reviewer responsibilities toward readers

- Assess whether the manuscript's methodology and analytical approach are described in sufficient detail to allow readers to evaluate the scientific rigor of the study and, where appropriate, enable replication of the research.
- Identify whether the manuscript appropriately acknowledges and cites relevant prior scholarship in the field.

Ethical Responsibilities of Reviewers

Confidentiality

Review materials submitted for peer evaluation must be treated as confidential and should not be shared or discussed outside the formal review process unless this is explicitly authorized by the editor or required by exceptional circumstances. Because manuscripts under review constitute private scholarly communications, reviewers are expected to protect both the authors' identity (where applicable) and the content of the submission. Reviewers should not keep copies of submitted manuscripts or use any information obtained through the review for purposes unrelated to the evaluation process. While editors and reviewers necessarily require access to manuscript materials in order to conduct the evaluation, the involvement of additional individuals in the review process should occur only in accordance with the journal's established policies. If a reviewer wishes to consult another person as part of the assessment, prior approval from the editor should be obtained.

Constructive critique

Reviewers should provide balanced evaluations that acknowledge a manuscript's strengths while identifying limitations, concerns, or areas requiring improvement in a constructive manner. Feedback should be sufficiently clear and specific so that authors, editors, and editorial decision-makers can understand the basis for the reviewer's assessment. When reviewers raise concerns that rely on previously established findings or published scholarship, these observations should be supported by appropriate references. The purpose of peer review is not merely to identify shortcomings, but also to offer thoughtful guidance that can help strengthen the work while respecting the author's scholarly independence. Although peer review is conducted confidentially, reviewer comments should be written with the understanding that anonymity cannot always be guaranteed. Reviewers may also communicate concerns or contextual information confidentially to the editorial team through the journal's designated reviewer comments to the editor, when such information is relevant to the editorial decision-making process and not intended for authors.

Competence

Reviewers should assess honestly whether they possess the subject-matter or methodological expertise required to provide a well-informed evaluation of a manuscript. If their knowledge does not sufficiently

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

cover key aspects of the submission, this should be communicated to the editor. Reviewers are not expected to be experts in every dimension of a manuscript, but they should accept a review invitation only when they can offer a credible and competent assessment of the areas under consideration. Accepting a review assignment without the necessary expertise may result in an inaccurate evaluation, including the possibility of endorsing publication of work with significant shortcomings or, conversely, recommending rejection of a manuscript of genuine merit. In such circumstances, declining the invitation to review is the more appropriate course of action.

Impartiality and integrity

Reviewer assessments should be grounded in fair, objective, and evidence-based judgment, free from personal or professional bias. Evaluations should focus exclusively on the scholarly quality of the manuscript, including its scientific merit and its alignment with the journal's scope and mission, without regard to the authors' race, ethnic background, national origin, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, institutional affiliation, (dis)ability, or any personal or professional advantage that might arise from privileged access to the manuscript. At the same time, reviewers should remain attentive to the diverse contexts in which research is conducted. This includes being sensitive to differences between Global North and Global South settings, such as variations in resources, infrastructure, access to data, and research priorities. Evaluations should therefore account for contextual constraints and contributions, recognizing that high-quality research may take different forms across settings.

Reviewers must not use information obtained through the peer-review process for personal gain or to disadvantage others. If a reviewer believes that a personal, professional, or other significant conflict of interest could compromise their impartiality, they should decline the invitation to review and, where appropriate, discuss the matter with the editor.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

Peer-review processes should be structured, as far as reasonably possible, to reduce the risk of actual or perceived bias in manuscript evaluation. Reviewers who identify any interest—whether personal, professional, financial, or otherwise—that could compromise, or reasonably appear to compromise, their impartiality should promptly inform the editors and, where appropriate, decline the review invitation or seek guidance on how the situation should be managed. Some journals may also require reviewers to formally disclose potential conflicts of interest through documentation comparable to that requested from authors.

Timeliness and responsiveness

Reviewers are expected to respond promptly to review invitations and to follow the journal's instructions for completing and submitting their evaluations. Timeliness is an important component of an effective peer-review process, and delays can negatively affect editorial decision-making and authors' publication timelines. Reviewers should make every reasonable effort to submit their assessments within the requested timeframe. If they anticipate being unable to meet the deadline, they should notify the editors as soon as possible, either to decline the invitation or to determine whether an adjusted timeline can be accommodated.

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

Step-By-Step Guide to Reviewing a Manuscript

When you receive an invitation to peer review, you will be sent a copy of the paper's abstract to help you decide whether you wish to do the review. Try to respond to invitations promptly - it will prevent delays. It is also important at this stage to declare any potential Conflict of Interest.

Overview of the Review Report Format

Because JRIPE is an interdisciplinary journal, submissions may reflect a range of theoretical perspectives, methodological approaches, and disciplinary traditions. To support a fair, constructive, and consistent peer-review process across this diversity, reviewers are asked to follow the journal's recommended review structure when preparing their evaluations.

This format helps ensure that authors receive constructive and meaningful feedback, and that the editorial team has the information needed to make informed decisions, while preserving space for your disciplinary expertise and scholarly judgment. The review form also includes an option to provide confidential comments to the editors when needed.

Detailed guidance on the review format and evaluation criteria is provided below.

The First Read-Through

Once you have accepted the invitation to review and accessed the full manuscript, begin with an initial read-through to develop an overall understanding of the submission. This first reading is intended as an orientation rather than a detailed critique. Your goal is to understand the manuscript's purpose, scholarly contribution, and overall approach before moving to a more in-depth assessment.

Initial Considerations

As you complete your first read-through, the following questions may help guide your initial assessment:

- What is the central question, objective, or argument of the manuscript? Is it relevant to JRIPE's readership and scope?
- What contribution does the manuscript seek to make to interprofessional research, education, policy, or practice? Is that contribution meaningful and sufficiently clear?
- Does the manuscript demonstrate originality, whether through its topic, conceptual framing, methodology, findings, or implications?
- Is the manuscript clearly written and organized in a way that allows its argument, methods, and conclusions to be understood?
- Do the conclusions or claims appear to be supported by the evidence, analysis, or reasoning presented?
- If the manuscript draws on a theoretical, methodological, or disciplinary tradition that differs from your own, can you assess whether the approach is coherent and appropriate on its own terms?
- Are the tables, figures, or supplementary materials useful and relevant to understanding the manuscript, or do they appear unnecessary?

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

- Are there any immediate concerns related to methodological rigor, conceptual clarity, ethical issues, reporting transparency, or fit with the journal that should be explored more closely in your detailed review?

Identifying Potential Significant Concerns

While your detailed evaluation should be based on a full reading of the manuscript, the initial read-through can help you identify issues that may substantially affect the manuscript's scholarly contribution or suitability for publication.

Examples of potentially major concerns include:

- Conclusions or claims that are not adequately supported by the data, analysis, or argument presented
- Significant methodological weaknesses or the use of an inappropriate or poorly justified research design or analytical approach
- Major conceptual inconsistencies or unclear theoretical framing
- Important omissions in relevant literature or context that substantially weaken the manuscript's contribution
- Ethical concerns related to the conduct, reporting, or integrity of the research
- A manuscript whose focus falls clearly outside the scope or mission of JRIPE

The presence of one or more of these concerns does not necessarily determine the editorial outcome, but they should be carefully examined and clearly addressed in your review.

Concerns Related to Reporting or Evidence

Some concerns identified during the first read may relate less to the underlying quality of the work and more to how the manuscript is reported. If there are critical flaws in this, it's very likely the manuscript will need to be rejected. Potential concerns may include:

- Insufficient detail about the methodology, analysis, or context to understand how the study was conducted or how conclusions were reached
- Claims, interpretations, or conclusions that are not adequately supported by the evidence or argument presented
- Missing, unclear, or incomplete information that limits the manuscript's transparency or interpretability
- Limited engagement with relevant scholarship or omissions in the literature that weaken the manuscript's framing or contribution
- Tables, figures, or supplementary materials that are unclear, unnecessary, or insufficiently informative

If you find a major problem, note your reasoning and clear supporting evidence (including citations).

Drafting the First Paragraphs of Your Review

After completing your initial read-through and reviewing any notes you have made, including observations about significant concerns, begin drafting the opening portion of your review. These initial paragraphs should succinctly summarize your understanding of the manuscript's research question or

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

purpose, the scholarly approach taken, and the contribution the work seeks to make. The first paragraph should:

- Help the editors properly contextualize the research and add weight to your judgement
- Show the author what key messages are conveyed to the reader, so they can be sure they are achieving what they set out to do
- Focus on successful aspects of the paper so the author gets a sense of what they've done well

The second paragraph should provide a conceptual overview of the contribution of the research. Therefore, you should comment on:

- Whether the paper's premise is interesting and important
- If appropriate methods are used
- Whether the data support the conclusions

After drafting these opening sections of your review, you should be in a stronger position to judge whether the manuscript has serious limitations that may preclude publication (see next section), or whether it appears sufficiently promising to warrant a more thorough and detailed evaluation.

Rejection After the First Reading

Even if your initial assessment suggests that a manuscript has significant shortcomings, it is important to read the submission in full before reaching a final judgment. Doing so ensures that your evaluation is fair, balanced, and informed by the complete context of the work, while also allowing you to identify strengths or constructive feedback that may be useful to the authors in improving future submissions.

A thorough review also helps ensure that any concerns you raise are accurate, well founded, and appropriately contextualized. If, after considering the manuscript as a whole, you conclude that rejection is warranted, **please refer to the section on recommendations regarding editorial decisions.**

Before Starting the Second Read-Through

If the manuscript appears to make a potentially publishable contribution after your initial review, proceed to a more detailed second reading. Before doing so, take a moment to review and organize your notes from the first read-through, including any preliminary strengths, concerns, or questions you wish to examine more closely.

Ensure that any tables, figures, appendices, or supplementary materials are readily accessible. The second read-through should allow for a more systematic and detailed assessment of the manuscript's argument, evidence, methodological or conceptual approach, and overall contribution.

The Second Read-Through

During your second reading, your focus should shift from forming an overall impression to conducting a more detailed evaluation of the manuscript's content, argumentation, and presentation.

As you work through the manuscript, pay close attention to the clarity and coherence of the authors' reasoning. Consider whether:

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

- any sections are unclear, confusing, or open to multiple interpretations
- factual inaccuracies appear to be present
- arguments are incomplete, inconsistent, or unsupported

You may also wish to consider:

- Does the title accurately represent the manuscript's focus?
- Does the abstract provide a clear summary of the manuscript that is easy to understand?
- Do the keywords appropriately reflect the manuscript's content?
- Is the manuscript's length proportionate to its contribution?
- Are the central messages communicated clearly and accurately?

Not all submissions will be equally polished in their presentation. Part of the reviewer's role is to identify places where the meaning is unclear or where the writing interferes with comprehension. That said, your primary responsibility is to assess the scholarly content of the manuscript, not to provide line-by-line copyediting.

If language or writing issues significantly affect readability, note this in your review. If the manuscript's meaning remains understandable, consider whether specific suggestions could help the authors improve clarity. If the writing prevents you from meaningfully evaluating the work, this should be clearly communicated in your assessment.

Minor grammatical or stylistic corrections may be worth flagging when they affect understanding, but extensive editing is not expected. Your focus should remain on helping the authors strengthen the manuscript's clarity, argument, and overall scholarly contribution.

Let's take a look now at section-by-section guidance.

1. The Introduction

A strong introduction should provide the foundation for the manuscript by clearly situating the study and explaining why it matters. As you review the introduction, consider whether it:

- clearly establishes the topic, problem, or central argument
- situates the manuscript within relevant scholarship or current debates
- identifies a meaningful gap, unresolved question, or area requiring further investigation
- makes a persuasive case for the significance and originality of the study
- gives readers a clear sense of the manuscript's purpose, intended contribution, and relevance to the journal's readership

Originality, Relevance, and Contribution

Claims of originality, relevance, and contribution should be assessed in relation to the existing literature. A manuscript's contribution may lie in addressing a genuinely underexplored topic, offering a new conceptual perspective, applying an established approach in a novel context, or extending existing knowledge in a meaningful way.

Authors may argue that a topic has received limited recent attention, but this claim should be considered carefully in light of developments in related fields, evolving theoretical debates, or methodological advances that may make renewed investigation worthwhile. In some cases, a study may

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

not be entirely novel but may still offer value through replication, confirmation, refinement, or application in a new setting.

As you read, ask yourself: Does this manuscript offer a meaningful contribution to current scholarship, or does it primarily restate what is already well established?

Research Purpose

Introductions often conclude by stating the study's objective, research question, or aims. By this stage, the manuscript's purpose should feel like a logical culmination of the argument presented. If the stated aims seem disconnected from the preceding discussion or emerge unexpectedly, the introduction may require strengthening.

2. Methods and Methodology

The methods or methodology section should provide enough detail for readers to understand how the research was conducted and to assess the credibility, rigor, and appropriateness of the approach. Expectations regarding methodological detail and reproducibility may differ across disciplinary and methodological traditions, but the manuscript should provide sufficient transparency to support informed evaluation.

Methodological Transparency

As you review this section, consider whether the manuscript provides enough information about:

- the research design or methodological approach
- participant recruitment, sampling, or data sources where relevant
- data collection and analytical procedures
- the theoretical, conceptual, or methodological assumptions guiding the work
- how conclusions were reached from the evidence or analysis presented

If important methodological details are missing or insufficiently explained, consider whether the omission limits your ability to assess the quality or trustworthiness of the study.

Rigor and Credibility

The standards used to establish rigor will vary depending on the research tradition and methodological approach. As appropriate to the manuscript, consider whether:

- the methods are suitable for addressing the research question or objective
- the analysis is appropriate, sufficiently developed, and adequately supported by the evidence or data presented
- the interpretations and conclusions are adequately supported by the evidence, data, or analysis presented
- claims are proportionate to the scope and limitations of the study
- the study demonstrates appropriate attention to methodological coherence and quality criteria relevant to the approach used

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

Ethical and Professional Standards

Reviewers should also consider whether the manuscript appears to follow appropriate ethical and professional standards. Depending on the nature of the study, this may include:

- evidence of ethics approval or informed consent procedures where applicable
- attention to participant confidentiality and data protection
- transparency regarding the role of researchers, practitioners, or partners in the study
- adherence to relevant reporting or professional guidelines appropriate to the field or methodology

If significant methodological or ethical concerns substantially limit the credibility or integrity of the work, these concerns should be clearly identified in the review.

3. Results and Discussion

The results and discussion sections should present and interpret the manuscript's main findings or arguments in a clear, coherent, and well-supported manner. Together, these sections should help readers understand what was found, how the findings were interpreted, and why they matter.

As you review these sections, consider whether:

- the findings, results, or central observations are presented clearly and logically
- the analysis is appropriate to the research question, methodology, or conceptual approach
- interpretations and conclusions are adequately supported by the evidence, data, or analysis presented
- statistical, qualitative, or theoretical claims are explained clearly and accurately
- the authors appropriately situate their findings in relation to existing scholarship or relevant debates
- the discussion meaningfully addresses the significance, implications, and limitations of the work
- gaps, inconsistencies, or unresolved issues are acknowledged and addressed appropriately
- tables, figures, quotations, or supplementary materials contribute meaningfully to the reader's understanding of the findings

The discussion should move beyond simply repeating the results. It should help readers understand the broader relevance and contribution of the work, while remaining proportionate to the scope and limitations of the study. Where appropriate, authors should identify areas requiring further investigation or explain how future research, practice, or educational initiatives might build on the findings presented.

4. Conclusions

The conclusion is often relatively brief (no more than a few paragraphs) and may appear either as a separate section or integrated into the discussion. Its purpose is to return to the manuscript's central objective or research question and reflect on how effectively it has been addressed. Like the study's aims, the conclusions should follow logically from the analysis and findings presented throughout the manuscript and should not introduce unexpected claims or arguments. If the conclusions are not adequately supported by the evidence, data, or analysis provided, it's appropriate to ask for them to be re-written.

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

5. Information Gathered: Images, Graphs and Data Tables

If you encounter findings, tables, figures, or other presented information that are difficult to interpret or that do not appear to support a clear argument, consider whether the issue lies in the way the material has been presented. Problems may stem from unclear titles or labels, insufficient explanation of the data, inappropriate statistical analysis, or poor image or figure quality.

Where information is clear, you should check that:

- The results seem plausible, in case there is an error in data gathering
- The trends you can see support the paper's discussion and conclusions
- There are sufficient data. For example, in studies carried out over time, are there sufficient data points to support the trends described by the author?

You should also check whether images have been edited or manipulated to emphasize the story they tell. This may be appropriate but only if authors report on how the image has been edited (e.g. by highlighting certain parts of an image). Where you feel that an image has been edited or manipulated without explanation, you should highlight this in a confidential comment to the editor in your report.

6. List of References

You will need to assess the reference list for its accuracy, adequacy, and overall balance. The goal is not to verify every citation individually, but to determine whether the manuscript is appropriately situated within the relevant scholarship.

Accuracy

If particular references are central to the manuscript's argument or claims, you should verify that they are cited accurately and appropriately. Citation and referencing conventions may vary across disciplines and methodological traditions, and reviewers are not expected to perform a comprehensive technical check of the entire reference list.

Adequacy

As you review the manuscript, consider whether the referencing is sufficient to support the arguments being made. Questions to keep in mind include:

- Are important claims, concepts, or arguments appropriately supported by relevant sources?
- Have the authors engaged with key scholarship or debates relevant to the topic?
- Are there important studies or perspectives that should reasonably be acknowledged or discussed?
- Does the manuscript situate its contribution appropriately within the existing literature?
- Are the references generally relevant, current where appropriate, and accessible to readers?

The number of references alone is not necessarily an indicator of quality or adequacy.

Balance

A well-constructed reference list should support readers while reflecting the breadth of relevant scholarship in the field. Consider whether the references:

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

- provide readers with appropriate context and foundational literature
- acknowledge relevant competing or complementary perspectives
- avoid excessive reliance on self-citation
- appropriately recognize influential or foundational contributions related to the topic under study

In most cases, reviewers should be able to assess the overall balance and appropriateness of the references without needing to verify every citation individually.

7. Plagiarism

By this stage in the review process, you will likely have developed a strong understanding of the manuscript and may identify potential concerns related to plagiarism.

Identifiable Concerns

If you encounter work that appears very similar to the manuscript under review, this may have an innocent explanation. For example, the authors may be extending their own previous research, or the similar work may have been published recently or in a different disciplinary area.

However, where substantial similarities exist between the manuscript and previously published work, these concerns should be considered carefully. You may wish to ask the authors to clarify how the current manuscript differs from related publications or how it advances prior work. In some cases, the overlap may be significant enough to raise concerns about the originality of the manuscript.

Reviewers may also find it helpful to identify related publications on the same topic or note instances where similar material appears to have been published elsewhere.

Suspected Concern

If you suspect plagiarism, including self-plagiarism, but cannot recall or locate exactly what is being plagiarized, notify the editor of your suspicion and ask for guidance.

Concerns about plagiarism are best identified during peer review so they can be addressed before publication. If plagiarism is discovered after publication, the consequences may be more serious for both authors and readers, because a retraction may be necessary.

For detailed guidelines see [COPE's Ethical guidelines for reviewers](#).

8. Title, Abstract, and Keywords for Search Engine Optimization (SEO)

After completing your detailed review of the manuscript, you should be able to assess whether the title, abstract, and keywords accurately represent the study and support the discoverability of the article.

Clear and informative titles, abstracts, and keywords help readers identify relevant articles through database and search engine results. The title and abstract are often the first parts of a manuscript that readers encounter, and they play an important role in determining whether readers continue to the full article. If these elements do not accurately reflect the manuscript's content or contribution, the visibility and accessibility of the work may be reduced.

As you review these elements, consider whether the abstract:

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

- accurately reflects the purpose and scope of the manuscript
- adequately summarizes the principal findings, arguments, or contributions
- highlights the most important or relevant aspects of the study
- presents the information clearly and concisely

You may also wish to consider whether the title and keywords appropriately reflect the manuscript's content and would help readers locate the article through relevant searches.

How to Structure Your Report

Please try as much as possible to adhere to the following structure in your reviewer report. This will allow the editors to synthesize feedback from different reviewers on the same article.

1. Summary of the Manuscript

Begin with a short summary of the manuscript in your own words. This section helps demonstrate your understanding of the submission and provides context for your evaluation.

You may wish to address:

- the manuscript's purpose or research question
- the methodological or conceptual approach
- the principal findings, arguments, or contributions
- the manuscript's relevance to interprofessional research, education, policy, or practice

This section should be descriptive rather than evaluative.

2. Overall Assessment

Provide your overall evaluation of the manuscript's scholarly contribution and suitability for JRIPE. Begin with constructive or positive feedback where appropriate. Authors are often more receptive to constructive comments and feedback when strengths are also acknowledged. However, avoid overstating positive aspects if your overall recommendation is rejection.

You may wish to consider:

- the originality, relevance, or significance of the contribution in the context of the existing literature and current knowledge
- the clarity and coherence of the manuscript
- the appropriateness of the methodology, conceptual framing, or analytical approach
- the rigor, credibility, or trustworthiness of the work
- the manuscript's fit with JRIPE's interdisciplinary readership and mission

This section should help editors understand your overall assessment before turning to detailed comments.

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

3. Major Issues

Identify the principal concerns or issues that should be addressed before the manuscript can be considered further for publication. Major comments should focus on issues that substantially affect the manuscript's scholarly contribution, clarity, rigor, credibility, or suitability for JRIPE.

Major comments may relate to:

- conceptual or theoretical framing
- methodology, analysis, or interpretation
- organization or clarity of argument
- engagement with relevant literature
- reporting transparency or ethical concerns
- conclusions or claims that are insufficiently supported by the evidence, data, or analysis presented
- substantial overlap with previously published work that has not been adequately acknowledged
- major presentation or organizational issues that make the manuscript difficult to assess

As you prepare your comments, consider:

- Are there significant concerns that materially affect the manuscript's contribution or credibility?
- If major revisions are required, have you clearly explained what changes are needed and why?
- Are your concerns proportionate to their impact on the manuscript as a whole?
- Are there ethical concerns or sensitive issues that would be more appropriately communicated in the confidential comments to the editors?

Comments should be as specific, constructive, and actionable as possible.

4. Minor Issues

Provide additional suggestions that may strengthen the manuscript but are less central to its overall contribution.

These comments may include:

- requests for clarification
- suggestions related to organization or readability
- missing references or contextual information
- issues involving tables, figures, formatting, or presentation
- minor methodological or reporting clarifications
- grammatical or stylistic issues that affect comprehension

Reviewers are not expected to provide detailed copyediting.

5. Recommendation to the Editors

At the conclusion of the review, please indicate the recommendation that best reflects your evaluation of the manuscript:

- Accept (select from dropdown: *Accept Submission*)
- Accept with minor revisions (select from dropdown: *Revisions Required*)
- Revise and resubmit / major revisions (select from dropdown: *Resubmit for Review*)

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

- Reject (select from dropdown: *Decline Submission*)

Please ensure that your recommendation is consistent with the comments and concerns identified throughout your review.

On Presentation and Tone

Your review should aim to help authors strengthen their manuscript through clear, respectful, and constructive feedback. Reviews should be professional in tone, evidence-based in their assessment, and focused on the scholarly content of the submission rather than the authors themselves.

As you prepare your review:

- Write clearly and directly so your comments can be understood by authors from diverse disciplinary, linguistic, and international backgrounds.
- Avoid unnecessarily complex, ambiguous, or overly harsh language.
- Organize your comments in a logical way and, where possible, refer to relevant page or line numbers when making specific observations.
- Clearly indicate which section, argument, or aspect of the manuscript your comments address.
- Distinguish between major concerns and minor suggestions where appropriate.
- Frame criticisms constructively by explaining concerns and, where possible, suggesting ways the manuscript could be strengthened.
- Treat the manuscript and its authors with the same professionalism, care, and respect you would expect in response to your own work.

Confidential Comments to Editors

JRIPE's review platform includes a section for confidential comments to the editors. This space may be used to communicate information that is relevant to the editorial decision-making process but may not be appropriate to share directly with the authors.

Confidential comments may be appropriate for concerns related to:

- suspected plagiarism or substantial overlap with previously published work
- potential ethical issues or breaches of research integrity
- undisclosed conflicts of interest or possible bias
- concerns about duplicate publication or authorship
- sensitive professional or procedural matters relevant to the review process

This section may also be used to elaborate on your publication recommendation or to provide context that may assist the editors in interpreting your review.

Confidential comments should remain professional, objective, and evidence-based. Reviewers should avoid using this section to make dismissive, inflammatory, or unsupported criticisms that are not communicated constructively in the main review. Even though these comments are not ordinarily shared with authors, they should be written with the same level of professionalism and fairness expected throughout the review process.

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

Recommendations and Editorial Decisions

As part of the review process, reviewers are asked to provide a recommendation regarding the manuscript. Your recommendation should reflect your overall assessment of the manuscript's scholarly contribution, rigor, clarity, and suitability for publication in JRIPE.

Please ensure that the recommendation you select is consistent with the comments provided throughout your review. Reviewers should communicate their recommendation clearly and explain the reasoning underlying their assessment.

Recommending Acceptance

If you recommend acceptance or minor revisions, explain the principal strengths of the manuscript and identify any areas that may still benefit from improvement. Even when a manuscript is strong overall, brief and constructive suggestions can help authors further strengthen the work.

Recommending Revision

If you recommend revisions, clearly identify the changes you believe are necessary before the manuscript can be reconsidered for publication. Distinguish, where possible, between major concerns that substantially affect the manuscript and more minor suggestions intended to improve clarity, organization, or presentation.

Constructive and specific feedback is particularly important when revisions are requested. Authors should be able to understand the basis of your concerns and the kinds of changes that may help address them.

Recommending Rejection

If you recommend rejection, explain the principal reasons for your recommendation clearly and directly. Major concerns may relate to issues such as substantial methodological or conceptual weaknesses, insufficient support for conclusions, serious ethical concerns, or a lack of fit with the journal's scope and mission.

Even when recommending rejection, reviews should remain respectful, constructive, and professionally written. The goal is to provide editors with a well-supported assessment and, where possible, offer feedback that may still be useful to the authors in future work.

When serious concerns fundamentally limit the manuscript's suitability for publication, reviewers are not expected to provide extensive detailed editing or presentation advice. However, the review should still provide enough explanation to support the recommendation and assist the editorial decision-making process.

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Peer reviewers are selected for their expertise and in-depth knowledge of the field. Their evaluations and recommendations are crucial to the publication process, providing invaluable advice to guide editors in their final decisions. Notably, the peer review process is built on trust among authors, reviewers, and editors. With the advent of AI tools that are still in early stages of development,

JRIPE Reviewer Resources

limitations such as inadequate or faulty evidence, or biased entries persist. Importantly, submitted manuscripts may contain proprietary information and therefore should not be shared beyond the outlined peer review process. Consequently, the *Journal of Interprofessional of Research in Practice and Education* does not permit uploading of manuscripts to generative AI programs as this will compromise the review process. If any component of the peer review process was supported by generative AI, peer reviewers must declare the details of usage to editors.