Perspectives in Public Health: Guidelines for Reviewers

Aims and Scope

Perspectives in Public Health (PPH) is a bi-monthly peer-reviewed journal. It is practice orientated and its primary aim is to be an invaluable resource for the Society's members, who are health-promoting professionals from many disciplines, including environmental health, health protection, health and safety, food safety and nutrition, building and engineering, primary care, academia and government. In addition to members, *PPH* targets practitioners and policy makers, researchers and academics. The journal considers submissions on all aspects of public health across all disciplines, focusing firmly on the Society's mission 'Vision, Voice and Practice'. Typically these are:

- practice based
- systematic reviews
- digests of policy analysis with relevance to practitioners
- implementation and/or evaluation of health protection and health promotion initiatives
- economic analyses of health protection and health promotion initiative

Peer review policy overview

Original research papers, secondary research, articles and short reports are peer-reviewed by subject specialists. *PPH* operates a 'double-blind' review process, which means that the identities of the referees are kept from the authors, and vice versa.

Peer review is central to publishing *PPH*, providing authors with valuable feedback on their work, acting as a quality control and informing the editor's decision-making process.

Article types

Authors are requested to adhere to the following guidelines when preparing their article for peer review. Reviewers are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the author guidelines and the journal expectations. Full author guidelines for *PPH* can be found at http://www.uk.sagepub.com/journals/Journal201762/manuscriptSubmission

<u>Original research</u>: Submissions will need to show appropriate ethical approval. Length: 2,000-4,000 words. Requisites: key words, structured abstract, methods, results, discussion, conclusions, references. Abstracts for original research papers should be structured under the following headings: aims, methods, results, and conclusions. Abstracts should be no more than 400 words.

<u>Secondary research</u>: Length: 2,000-4,000 words. Requisites: key words, abstract, rationale, methods, results, discussion, conclusions, references.

<u>Articles</u>: must be of general interest, and preference will be given to those appropriate for publication in up-coming themed issues. Length: 2,000-4,000 words. Requisites: key words, abstract, introduction, headings/subheadings and boxed content (e.g. background information) as appropriate, conclusions, references.

<u>Short reports</u>: an opportunity to present research findings that do not constitute a full paper. Length: 1,000-1,500 words, No abstract or keywords are required, and there should be a maximum of 10 references and 1 table or figure.

PEER REVIEW PROCEDURE

Manuscript annotation

Reviewers are encouraged to make annotations on the manuscript document and submit this to the editorial office as part of the peer review process. An annotated manuscript is not a compulsory part of the review process, although authors often find this helpful.

Referee Form

All reviewers will be asked to complete a reviewer form, in two parts. Referee Form A

For use by editorial staff only; this form will not be seen by authors. Referees are asked to indicate their response to questions on a sliding scale of 1-5, 1 being poor and 5 being excellent. The form prompts reviewers to assess the overall suitability of the article for publication in *PPH* and the quality of the paper in terms of rigour, readability, importance, usefulness, originality and structure.

Referee Form B

The comments made on this form will be sent to the authors. All questions encourage full text responses. Referees are asked to consider the article in light of the following:

- 1. Does the title succinctly and accurately represent the contents?
- 2. Are the keywords appropriate?
- 3. Does the abstract represent the content and conclusions of the paper? Is the abstract concise?
- 4. Is the context made explicit?
- 5. Is the methodology appropriate and well managed?
- 6. Are references appropriate and up to date?
- 7. Is the textual presentation and use of graphs/illustrations appropriate and effective?
- 8. Other comments in this section should be structured as numbered bullet points.

Reviewer recommendation

Reviewers are asked to make an overall recommendation on the suitability of the article for publication in its current form. The reviewer selects one of the following options on Referee Form A:

- a. Accept for publication without modification
- b. Publication subject to minor modifications (referee does not request to see an amended draft)
- c. Amendments required (referee requests to see a further draft before approval for publication)
- d. Revision and resubmission (paper requires substantial rewriting)
- e. Rejection

Additional points to note

- **1.** Reviewers are kindly asked to review revised versions of the original submission if they recommend the decision 'Amendments required'.
- 2. There is space in the reviewer form allocated for additional comments for editorial staff. Reviewers should mention if the paper should be seen by a specialist, if they feel the subject matter is time sensitive, or if the paper is controversial.
- **3.** Specific grammatical and typographical points will be addressed by editorial staff prior to publication; however, reviewers are encouraged to note instances where errors confuse meaning.

Reviewer thanks

The RSPH and SAGE Publications thank reviewers for their continued generous support of the journal. In acknowledgment of this, reviewers of *PPH* are offered the following:

- free access to all journals hosted on the <u>SAGE Journals Online</u> platform for a period of 30 days and a 25% discount on SAGE books
- all PPH reviewers are entered into an annual prize draw
- reviewers are annually acknowledged in an issue of the journal.