Evaluation Criteria:

- Significance of the article
- Appropriateness for JBP
- Appropriateness of literature review
- Strength of methodology/approach
- Strength of data analysis (quantitative or qualitative)
- Conceptual strength
- Quality of writing
- Potential impact for practice
- Potential impact for scientific advancement

1. Be open minded to new research ideas, interdisciplinary approaches, and unconventional methodologies. Journals like JBP are particularly well suited for publishing work that is both within and outside standard conventions, assuming it still falls within the journal’s vision.

2. We all know from personal experience that perfect research is not possible. We can and should have high, but realistic, standards.

3. Be sure to number all your comments to the author.

4. We are looking for articles that meaningfully advance scientific understandings and/or science-based practice.

5. The explicit testing of theory is not a litmus test for the value of a manuscript submitted to JBP. The role (or lack thereof) of theory is dependent upon the nature of the question under study. For example, research submitted to JBP may be phenomenon/practice driven. We do expect all submissions to be well-grounded (broadly defined) and have a strong conceptual rationale.

6. To meet our goal of timely feedback in a reasonable time frame, please return your review within 6 weeks of receipt.

7. Please note that it is our goal to render a decision on a manuscript after at most two revisions. We do not want to overburden our reviewers or the authors with too many revisions.

8. Your goal as a reviewer is to not only identify substantive problems with a manuscript, but also help the author to figure out how to fix the manuscript (if possible). Being critical is important, but also be constructive and instructive.

9. Help authors to understand your major issues versus your minor concerns. Be sure the author understands what is essential versus what is suggested.

10. Treat the author how you would like to be treated, with respect.

11. It is easy to recommend collecting more and better data. What is more constructive is to provide suggestions on how to use the current data or readily available additional data to improve the manuscript.
12. We expect all papers to be well-written. However, it will be the case that non-native English speakers will be submitting manuscripts to the journal. Although we will desk-reject very poorly written work, to be an inclusive global outlet, we will need to be patient at times. We need to constructively recommend improvements, without being dismissive.

13. When reviewing a revised manuscript, be sure to look at the author’s responses to your comments in the greater context of responses to all comments received.

14. Try to be specific in your comments.

15. Proofread your comments to be sure they are clear.

16. Include positive comments in your review or in your opening/summary statement.

17. Be sure that it is clear to the author that you have thoroughly read their manuscript.

18. One to two pages of total content is just fine.

19. Be sure your comments to the author line up with your overall evaluation of the manuscript. For example, don’t come across like you love the paper if you are recommending a rejection.

20. Do not discuss a publication recommendation in your comments to the author.

21. In your comments to the Editor, feel free to write whatever you like that will help us to make the best possible decision.

22. If you have reviewed the manuscript for another journal, please let us know and we will reassign it.

23. If you are aware of the author’s identity and believe it will impact your ability to provide a fair review, let us know.