

Guidelines for Referees

JCCA Manuscript Review Form*

The JCCA is dependent upon peer review to ensure the quality and usefulness of its scientific articles. Submitted manuscripts that pass an initial screening are reviewed by 2 to 5 referees who are not identified in the editor's report to the author(s). In fact, it is the policy of the JCCA to ensure mutual anonymity. The criteria used in judging the suitability of articles for publication will vary from journal to journal. The following guidelines are given in an effort to standardize the review procedure.

Referees are asked for a critical assessment of a paper. Referees should understand that they are allowed to refuse to review a manuscript without giving reasons. As well, they should understand that they serve as advisors to the editor and are not final arbiters. Journal policy may at times dictate that the editor act contrary to a referee's advice.

- 1 The title is
 - adequately descriptive
 - appropriate
- 2 The abstract is
 - concise
 - adequate
 - appropriately reflects content of paper
- 3 The key words are
 - suitable
 - chosen with information retrieval in mind
- 4 The experimental design and methodology are
 - sufficient
 - well controlled
 - faulty
- 5 The experimental data is
 - excessive
 - adequate
 - insufficient
- 6 The calculations and statistical treatment are
 - clear
 - concise
 - adequate
 - correct
- 7 The interpretation is
 - appropriate
 - has serious omissions
 - vague
 - too generalized
- 8 The conclusions are
 - adequately supported by the data
 - valid
 - appropriate
- 9 The discussion is
 - relevant
 - clear
 - justified
- 10 The illustrations and tables are
 - sufficient
 - appropriate
 - of poor quality
 - of poor clarity
- 11 The references are
 - relevant
 - necessary
 - excessive
 - support the manuscript
- 12 The manuscript style is
 - too brief
 - too comprehensive
 - poorly arranged
 - parts of paper require elaboration
 - parts of paper require condensation
 - parts of paper not clear
 - contains irrelevant material
- 13 Overall judgement
 - important paper
 - timely
 - interesting
 - original
 - confirmatory
 - speculative
 - too preliminary
 - suited to JCCA objectives
- 14 Disposition
 - accept
 - accept after satisfactory revision
 - reconsider after major revision
 - reject
 - I would allow editor to judge quality of revisions
 - I wish to see revised manuscript

Allan Gotlib, DC
Editor, JCCA

Nous avons
besoin de
votre appui.
On peut
vaincre
le cancer.



* currently under review