

Peer Review Guidelines

The *GW 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. 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 via Scholastica, 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 at gwupress@gmail.com.

Submission Ratings: When you submit your review via Scholastica, you will be asked to rate the following questions on a 1–5 rating scale (i.e. Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree).

1. The article makes a significant contribution to scholarship.
2. This article adequately engages with the relevant scholarly literature.
3. The article is professionally written, easy to read, and generally free from grammar or spelling errors.
4. The research methodology for the study is appropriate and applied properly. Note: not all articles will have methodology.
5. The literature review was thorough given the objectives and content of the article.

You will then have a text box to provide narrative comments to the author. A separate box is included for any comments you want to provide to the editor but not the author. This could include information that might reveal your identity.

To guide your narrative response, please consider the questions below.

Review Questions

You are not expected to answer all questions, but they should guide your thinking.

- + 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?

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?

Decision Recommendation:

You will also be asked to provide a recommendation for publication:

- ✦ **Accept, no revisions needed:** Paper is well written and a significant contribution to the literature. No improvement needed.
- ✦ **Revise and resubmit, minor revisions requested:** Well-written, well-organized with some minor edits to arguments, research, or analysis. Additional including formatting, grammar, or style suggestions required.
- ✦ **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.

- ♦ **Reject for publication:** Manuscript is not within journal scope or does not meet the standards threshold for publication.