

Peer Review Guidelines

The *Journal of Ethics in Publishing* welcomes articles, case studies, and conference presentations from students, professionals, and scholars on a range of topics, including: EDI (equity, diversity, inclusion), accessibility, peer review, open access, sustainability, publishing metrics, and any other aspects of ethics in publishing. All submissions are subject to peer review.

Peer review is a fundamental element of scholarly communication that provides valuable guidance to authors in the development and improvement of their submissions and protects journal integrity.

Peer reviews should focus on adhering to the following values: equity, openness, respect, and quality. Final decision for publication will be made by the Editor-in-Chief after considering peer review from multiple reviewers.

GWJEP uses double-masked peer review, so neither the author nor the reviewer know each other's identity unless indicated in advance. Manuscripts are confidential and only shared for the purposes of peer review.

Peer Review Guidelines:

Before you review: When you receive a request to review, you should first assess the **time commitment**, your **applicable expertise**, and if you have any **conflicts of interest**.

A conflict of interest can be financial, such as if you benefit from a product, service, or company that is mentioned in the submission. Other conflicts include personal or close professional relationships with the author(s), which could impact your review of the manuscript, either positively or negatively. If you are unsure if something constitutes a conflict, you should contact the editor or include this information in your review.

If you would like to volunteer to review for the journal, please contact us.

Review Questions

Please provide a few sentences in each section below, as applicable. Although the review may be critical, personal attacks are never appropriate in peer review. Instead, focus on opportunities to improve the submission.

In the final section, provide your recommendation to the editor. Note if any subject matter within the article is outside your field of knowledge, or if there is anything else that you want to disclose to the editor.

Overall

- ✦ What are the strengths of the manuscript?
- ✦ Does the article contribute to the scholarly field? For example, is it original, is it valid, and does it contribute to the understanding of ethical issues in publishing?
- ✦ Are the author's arguments clear, logical, and concise?
- ✦ Is the article well-written and well-organized? Are there sections that could be improved?
- ✦ Is there a consistent use of style (Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) throughout?

Introduction

- ✦ Is the premise or purpose of the submission clear?
- ✦ If applicable, is relevant literature reviewed and synthesized across themes, methods, or findings, rather than by author?
- ✦ Are the authors' assumptions clarified and addressed?

Methodology

This section will only be relevant for research articles.

- ✦ Is the methodology appropriate and comprehensive?
- ✦ Do you know who studied, when the study took place, and how research was conducted?
- ✦ Has the study taken into account diversity and inclusivity as part of the design?

- ✦ Did the author address limitations of the study design, such as the participant sample used?

Conclusion

- ✦ Is the conclusion logical and appropriate to what has come before in the body of the article?
- ✦ Is there sufficient evidence presented in the text for the conclusion?

Discussion

- ✦ If applicable, does the manuscript provide a clear summary of the findings of the study at the end?
- ✦ Does the author make convincing connections between findings in this study and the field?
- ✦ Are implications for this topic and future research or practice discussed?
- ✦ Do recommendations clearly stem from the results?

Recommendations for publication (select one):

1. **Accept, no revisions needed:** Paper is well written and a significant contribution to the literature. No improvement needed.
2. **Revise, minor revisions requested:** Well-written, well-organized with some minor edits to arguments, research, or analysis. Additional including formatting, grammar, or style suggestions required.
3. **Revise, major revisions requested:** Paper is promising, but requires multiple major revisions, such as more research, depth, or analysis. Several sections require rewriting in order to improve clarity, flow, or arguments. Revised manuscript may undergo peer review again.
4. **Reject for publication:** Manuscript seems unable to conform

to acceptable standards even after revision, or is not within the journal's scope.

Optional section:

Please use the area below for any comments to the editor that *will not be provided* to the author.