Review Procedure
The Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health utilizes a double-blind review procedure: neither the author nor the reviewer know each other’s identity. This process is utilized in order to maintain the integrity of the review process.

Reviewer Responsibilities
Reviewers are to avoid all conflicts of interest. If you are invited to review a paper for which you believe there may be a conflict of interest, e.g., you recognize the author(s) as a colleague or student despite the double blinding, etc., please bring that to the attention of the editor immediately.

If you feel that you are not qualified to review a particular manuscript, or are qualified to review only certain aspects of a manuscript, please advise the editor as soon as possible.

Manuscripts are to be treated as confidential documents. They are not to be shared or discussed with colleagues, students, or others.

Review Criteria
Each reviewer should indicate whether the manuscript is suitable for publication in the Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health. There are three major criteria: (1) whether the manuscript falls within the scope of the Journal, (2) whether the manuscript reflects good science, and (3) whether the writing is of a quality that warrants publication.

The following items should be considered in your review of the paper and your recommendation.

General Considerations
- Is the research newsworthy or timely?
- Does the research advance methods or knowledge in the field?
- Is there any evidence of plagiarism?
- Does the research reflect the parsing of a study question into multiple minute components to maximize the possible number of publications?

Evaluating the Science
Original Research Papers
- Is the abstract structured appropriately, in accordance with instructions to authors?
- Is the research question clear?
- Does the methods section provide sufficient detail with respect to participants, procedures, and measures?
- Are the methods consistent with the research question/hypothesis?
• If the paper is original research, do the authors indicate that ethical review of the research prior to its initiation occurred by an institutional review board (IRB) or research ethics committee (REC) or do they provide an explanation of what alternate procedure was utilized for ethical review of the research? A manuscript that lacks this verification will not be accepted for publication.
• Were the analytic strategies that were utilized, whether the research is quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods, appropriate?
• Was the sample size sufficient to support the findings and conclusions?
• Is the discussion consistent with the results or does it overstate the implications and/or significance of the results?
• Does the discussion place the research findings in the context of existing knowledge?
• Do the authors acknowledge the limitations of their study findings?

Review Papers
• Is the review of the literature thorough? Does it include all major papers on the subject?
• Have the authors thoughtfully integrated their review of the literature to identify gaps in our knowledge, future directions for research, major themes, etc.?

Theoretical and Policy Papers
• Does the paper offer insights into the strengths and deficiencies of current policy/theory?
• Are statements supported by empirical findings noted in the literature?
• Does the paper offer suggested alternative approaches and reflect upon intended and unintended consequences of these options?

Evaluating the Writing
• Does the title accurately convey the focus of the paper?
• Is the title of an appropriate length or is it too wordy?
• Is the paper organized/structured appropriately?
• Does the abstract concisely and accurately convey the critical aspects of the manuscript?
• Is the number of tables appropriate for the length and nature of the manuscript? Are the tables and text redundant?
• Does the writing reflect appropriate word choice and correct English grammar?
• Has the appropriate format been utilized for the reference?
• Have the authors avoided the use of first person (“I,” “me”)?
• Is the length of the paper appropriate?

Making a Final Recommendation
We ask that reviewers indicate their opinion regarding the disposition of a paper using one of the following ratings:
• Accept as is
• Accept conditional on revisions
• Resubmit with major revision
• Reject