

IJOPN Peer Reviewer Guide

Helpful Hints and Tips

Welcome and Thank You!

- Thank you for serving as an IJOPN peer reviewer!
 - Your service is critical to the journal's quality and success
 - You may find this IJOPN editorial essay of interest
 - <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/opn.12246>
 - The entire editorial team is grateful for your service!
- Please consider creating a Publons profile
 - Visit <https://publons.com/about/home/> to create your profile
 - Publons tracks your peer review service across journals
 - Publons also provides resources to enhance your review skills

Enjoy Our IJOPN Peer Reviewer Guide

- Whether you are a new or established reviewer, we hope that...
 - You will benefit from these hints and tips we have collected
 - Your reviews will be less time consuming and more efficient
 - Your service to IJOPN will increase in value to you over time
- As a reviewer, please know that as a peer reviewer...
 - You are a partner with the Editorial Team
 - You help maintain the aims of IJOPN
 - You help arbitrate the value of a submission with your review
 - Your insights offer important information about a submission

About This Peer Reviewer Guide

- What this guide does...
 - Explains the IJOPN Peer Reviewer Guidelines
 - Illustrates expectations for IJOPN peer review of manuscripts
 - Offers hints and tips that the Editorial Team find useful in peer review
- What this guide contains...
 - An outline of the IJOPN peer review process
 - A review of the IJOPN Peer Review Guidelines
 - A compilation of helpful hints and useful tips for peer review

IJOPN Peer Review Process

- Peer review begins with an invitation to review
 - Invitations are based on matching manuscript to reviewer profile
 - Hint! Update your profile at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/opn> to insure invitations within your area of expertise
- Once you receive an invitation to review, please respond as soon as possible
 - IJOPN uses an auto-decline feature if you don't respond after 2 weeks but remember that is 2 weeks of delay in the review process
 - Remember it is more helpful to decline an invitation or to note you are unavailable than to delay or not reply at all
 - Tip! Help the Editorial Team by suggesting alternate reviewers if you cannot accept an invitation to review – just reply to the invitation email

IJOPN Peer Review Process

- Complete the review as soon as possible
 - Login at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/opn> soon after accepting the invitation to scan the submission you are reviewing
 - Don't guess – ask the Editorial Team any questions you might have about the review by simply replying to the invitation email!
 - We all know what it feels like to await reviews after submitting a manuscript so be considerate of authors...
 - Tip! Dedicate sufficient time for your review so that you offer useful guidance and know that with practice your efficiency increases
 - Be descriptive and specific in your comments
 - Avoid recapitulating the manuscript content
 - List the concerns that need to be addressed in revision
 - Avoid general, judgmental, or harsh commentary

Completing the Peer Review

- Hint! Put yourself in “review mode”...
 - Arrange resources you need to complete the review
 - Read as an editor might, looking for structure and organization
 - Carefully note strengths and concerns as you read the manuscript
 - Organize your notes into review comments
 - Use the peer review guidelines – that’s why they were created!
 - Comments are most useful when clearly and specifically described
 - Offer critique by reflecting strengths and listing specific concerns
 - Provide examples of concerns from manuscript and include page number
 - Avoid judgmental language – negative or positive – and focus on facts
 - Remember you are evaluating manuscript quality and content...
 - You are not evaluating the authors but their work

Editorial: Greetings! Here's my vision

Greetings, readers of the *International Journal of Older People Nursing (IJOPN)*. I am happy to be addressing you here in our editorial feature as I embark on a journey as the new Associate Editor of this essential journal. You might ponder my use of the word essential here and wonder what my journey has to do specifically with you. Allow me to explain...

When I say essential, I share with you the word that captures my vision for *IJOPN*. A vision which I believe Editor-in-Chief Brendan McCormack and I wholeheartedly share. My vision is that *IJOPN* becomes essential reading for each and every nurse around the world who cares for older people, teaches care for older people, or investigates the dimensions and properties of the care needs of older people and their families. A rather all-encompassing vision you might say. I agree. Influence and impact in an ageing world requires big thinking and even bigger action.

The quality and quantity of evidence needed at basic, translational and implementation levels to establish and improve care for older people is staggering. As I travel around my own country – the United States – and around the world in places as diverse as Armenia and Hong Kong, unmet needs and questions that necessitate the development and advancement of nursing and interprofessional care for older people are exceedingly prominent. Among some of those questions are as follows: How do nurses meaningfully contribute to disease focused health care and highlight the issues of function and well-being as relevant concerns? In what ways can nurses shape health and social

care in settings not traditionally identified with care of older people? Where might nurses influence the discourse about health and social care priorities in both more and less rapidly ageing societies? The questions are endless and their answers most often lacking in quality evidence or well-constructed and evaluated implementation of extant evidence.

In an age where health and social care needs are pressing and information abundant, I believe we bear an even greater burden of evaluating available information and curating it in the context of current and projected needs. This burden is especially true for those of us who know that older people are the major consumers of health care and important users of social care as well. Trustworthy, well-curated evidence and information allows us to more successfully balance our roles in practice, education, research and policy making to achieve the ends we realise are necessary. We need trusted sources of impeccable quality to which we can turn to disseminate the evidence we generate and to identify that information we need to meet a present or projected challenge. While there are several wonderful journals in our discipline of gerontological and geriatric nursing around the world – I am privileged to be associated with the best of them in my country – I doubt there is consensus on which are our premier international journals.

Although *IJOPN* is a journal somewhat newer than some around the world, I believe that it can become that journal. The journal with the significant and widespread reputation with an ever growing impact factor attesting to the

publication and efficient and critical to every process. A con as truly trusted *IJOPN* benefit authors and a reviewers. None become the p gerontological journal calls for you our reader submit to and re Moreover, I believe authors, reviewer not think of the gerontological ar

The screenshot shows a web browser window with a Google Scholar search for 'Scholarly Vision'. The search results show 'About 543,000 results (0.05 sec)'. A search result is visible: 'Beyond scholarship reconsidered: Toward an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members' by tru.ca [PDF] PennText. Overlaid on the browser is a Microsoft Word window titled 'Document1 - Microsoft Word'. The Word window shows a review comment in a light blue box: 'Editorial: Greetings! Here's my vision'. Below the comment, the text reads: 'I appreciate the opportunity to review this manuscript for IJOPN. In reading the manuscript, I have the following comments regarding the content and approach:'. A numbered list follows with the number '1.'.

Tip! Develop a system for yourself to facilitate review...
Try opening manuscript PDF, WORD and search engine simultaneously

IJOPN Peer Review Guidelines

- IJOPN Peer Review Guidelines include two components
 - A peer reviewer tick list of questions relevant to all manuscripts
 - The tick list is a checklist is completed electronically in ScholarOne
 - Peer reviewer comment guidelines in two versions
 - One for *Peer Reviewer Comment Guide for Scoping and Integrative Reviews*
 - One for *Peer Reviewer Comment Guide for Research Reports and Systematic Reviews with or without Meta-Analyses*

IJOPN Peer Review Guidelines

- Tick List questions are “scored” using three replies for all manuscripts
 - YES
 - NO
 - NOT SURE/UNCLEAR
- Tick List questions include:
 - Is the manuscript well organized with a logical flow?
 - Are the methods clearly and accurately presented?
- Answering these questions aids in your review and helps the Editors
 - The tick list questions help ascertain the general quality of a manuscript

IJOPN Peer Review Guidelines

- Select the peer reviewer comment guidelines version that suits the manuscript under review
 - If you find that the manuscript does not warrant a YES in response to a specific question, use that response as prompt for yourself to outline in what ways it does not match the elements noted in that question.
- In the Peer Reviewer Comment Guide for Scoping and Integrative Reviews, you will find questions such as:
 - *Critical Review – are the findings of the research reports summarized appropriately and critically reviewed in an easily understandable format that includes narrative description, figures, tables, and quotes as appropriate?*
- In the Peer Reviewer Comment Guide for Research Reports and Systematic Reviews Including Those with Meta-Analyses, you will find questions such as:
 - *Data Collection, Management and Analysis – are data collection (including translation of text data into English if applicable and search strategies for reviews), management, and analysis clearly and appropriately described in light of the method presented?*

IJOPN Peer Review Guidelines

- Use the peer reviewer comment guidelines as a template
 - Hint! Copy the comment guidelines into WORD and using your responses to the questions as the narrative portion of your review
- Be specific as you list your concerns
 - Tip! State what needs to be improved rather than what is wrong...
 - Direct the authors to the section or paragraph to which you refer
 - Offer examples of what you mean in describing a specific concern
 - Note important references which are missing by including the citations
 - Consider IJOPNs international community of readers as you review
 - You represent them to the authors as they strive to revise their manuscript
 - Think about what you and colleagues wish to read in a manuscript

A Few Caveats...

- Enhance your peer reviews with courtesy and a positive perspective
 - Offer thanks for being able to provide a peer review
 - Provide direction to authors with suggestions for improvement
 - Be honest in your review and avoid overstating manuscript quality
 - Avoid making a recommendation to reject or accept in the comments
 - Avoid copy editing English language usage or style
 - Hint! Remember that Wiley have an English language editing service – you can suggest that authors make use of it
- Balance support for authors with expectations for quality
 - Achieve a perspective that balances consideration with high standards
 - Avoid being overly kind out of deference to authors
 - Recognize any conflict of interest and declare it in recusing yourself

Capture Peer Reviewing Benefits

- Hint! Serving as a peer reviewer allows you to become a better author
 - To take full advantage of this benefit...
 - Study how authors construct a manuscript and express writing style
 - Reflect both content and presentation in your review
 - Challenge yourself to learn more about the mechanics and art of writing
 - Use what you learn to improve your reviews and your writing
 - Take advantage of reviewing to improve your writing in narrative comments
- Know that scientific literature only improves with effective peer review
 - Editors, authors, and reviewers must share commitment to excellence

