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Welcome and Overview
Carol A. ("Pat") Patsdaughter, PhD, RN, CNE, ACRN
Associate Editor, JANAC
Professor, Florida International University

Who Can Be a JANAC Reviewer?
- nurses and colleagues from other disciplines
- clinicians/practitioners
- researchers/academicians
- content experts
- methodologists and statisticians
- seasoned and novice reviewers
- students
- retired persons

Value to Peer Reviewers
- 69-question survey with fixed-option and open-ended questions
- accessed on the Internet
- 1,675 reviewer respondents from 44 countries
- represented 52 nursing journals
### Value to Peer Reviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Becoming a Reviewer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contact with editor</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanted to learn skills or content</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advised by mentor or supervisor</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invited by journal</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responded to ad, volunteer</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleague encouraged or facilitated</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional obligation</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career advancement or tenure</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest in topic of paper</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value to Peer Reviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best or Most Rewarding Aspects of Reviewing</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exposure to paper's content/keeping up to date</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributing to nursing scholarship &amp; science</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaining skills</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributing to the profession</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helping others publish</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyment or satisfaction</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career advancement</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value to Peer Reviewers (cont.)

- addition to curriculum vitae or annual evaluation
- novice authors improve their own writing skills
- clinicians may learn new approaches to solving problems
- novice researchers may learn important insights into area of interest or research methodology
- recognition in last issue in volume & at ANAC conference
- ACRN Certification Renewal by Continuing Education Points (2 CEPs per year)

### Value to Authors

- impartial feedback to improve manuscript before publication
- high-quality, peer-reviewed publication in leading professional journal
- recognition in your area of expertise when article is published
- ACRN Certification Renewal by Continuing Education Points (5 CEPs per article/15 maximum per year)
Any author whose work has undergone peer review has an obligation to volunteer as a reviewer; to do otherwise may be seen as shirking a professional duty.

~ Priem & Rasheed, 2006

Value to JANAC

- JANAC has benefited from a diverse, rich, peer review panel of clinical & research experts.
- Reviewers have provided geographic representation and a wide range of expertise.
- JANAC has experienced a steady rise in IF.
- Of 97 nursing journals ranked by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) Journal Citation Reports in 2011, JANAC ranked 35 and had 501 citations for 21 articles, which is quite impressive for a specialty organization journal.

JANAC Impact Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value to JANAC

- JANAC’s raison d’etre is to serve the needs of ANAC’s membership and the broader practice and scientific community.
- Along with the contributions of the editorial staff and editorial board, JANAC has fulfilled its mission due, in large part, to the dedication and hard work of peer reviewers.
  
  It’s a win-win-win situation!
Reviewing in the System

Kristen Overstreet, BA
Managing Editor, JANAC

My Goals

- Show you how to become a JANAC reviewer
- Show you how to use the electronic system to submit reviews
Thank you for your review of the manuscript.

You may access your review comments and the decision letter (when available) by logging onto the Elsevier Editorial System at http://ees.elsevier.com/janac. Please log in as a Reviewer:

Your username: g. ********

If you need to retrieve password details, please go to: http://ees.elsevier.com/janac/external/quotes/exp

I hope you enjoyed using Scopus and that it helped you to review this article. If you have not yet activated or completed your 10-day full access to Scopus, using your PPP login details you can still do so via this link:

http://sciencesciences.coresources.com/BlasOblongName=OEBBLoblongName=CWBB Carrings

You can choose to start a 30-day access period at any time up to 8 months after the date you accepted the invitation to review.

Kind regards,

Lucy Bradley Spraggon, PhD, RN, ACNP, FAN
Editor
Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care

Resources

- See the Reviewer tutorial on the EES home page at http://ees.elsevier.com/janac
- See Elsevier’s Reviewer resources at http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/supportfaq.cws_home/faq_overview
**JANAC is on Facebook!**

Search for the *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care* and become a fan.

---

**Nuts & Bolts: Be a Great Reviewer!**

Lucy Bradley-Springer, PhD, RN, ACRN, FAAN
Editor, *JANAC*

---

**Peer Review . . .**

- Is a formal system of examining scientific work prior to publication
- Contributes to the creation, maintenance, and advance of the profession

---

**Peer Reviewers . . .**

Are essential partners in this process; they help to:
- determine potential for publication
- improve papers through suggestions for revision
- maintain practical & ethical integrity of the journal
Reviewing Ethics
- Conflicts of interest
- Confidentiality
- Do not contact author or others to discuss paper
- Do not request that an author cite your work

The JANAC Review
- Double Blinded – neither reviewer nor author know the identity of the other
- This system is felt to provide more objective critiques
- We use an unstructured format – but you can add structure as you wish!

JANAC Process
- Editor asks EES for suggested reviewers
- Reviewer invited (via email) based on self-disclosed areas of interest/expertise
  - Goal: no more than 1 every 3 months
- Please respond ASAP, especially if you can’t do the review
- Please complete within 21 days after agreeing to do the review

Quick Read for Content
- To determine if you can do the review
  - What if you can’t do the review?
  - What if you change your mind?
- To get an overall impression
- To prepare for an in-depth assessment of the manuscript
In-Depth Read for Specifics

- Are citations appropriate (complete, valuable, necessary, timely)?
- Is writing clear and easy to follow?
- Does the content progress logically?
  - Are there gaps in arguments or supporting materials?
  - Is introductory information synthesized so it leads the reader to the next steps?

In-Depth Read for Specifics

- Any indication of ethical problems?
  - Evidence of plagiarism, dual submission, previous publication, fraud? (notify editor)
  - Is protection of human participants discussed (as needed)?
  - Are the research, thought processes, theory base, analyses, and/or conclusions sound?
- What are the strengths & weaknesses?
- Is it appropriate for JANAC readers?

Acknowledge the Work

- Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper, which is a review of/study of/clinical paper on . . . This is a complex issue and timely to the work of nurses in HIV care.
- Not helpful:
  - The paper does not relate to the title
  - The article is confusing
  - This looks like a paper the author wrote for a sophomore nursing class

Give Positive Feedback First

- Be honest
- Your approach to this issue is an interesting combination of science and creative application to your theory base. It provides a unique perspective and can help nurses . . .
- Not helpful:
  - Nice job
  - Interesting ideas
  - Good topic
**Provide General Suggestions About Content, Organization, and Fit**

- Your paper is well written & has a nice flow. Better use of headers could help orient the reader (see APA manual).
- Take a look at the theoretical discussion provided by Jones (*JANAC*, 2005) as I think it would help with the problem you have integrating behavior change into your model.
- Please re-emphasize your main points (i.e., . . .) in your conclusion section.

---

**Provide Specific Comments for Improvement**

- A more in-depth discussion of your theory base (& a table explaining your variables) would help the reader get oriented. Specifically, I’d like to see (a) an explanation of (xxx) in the model and how it pertains to your topic, (b) a discussion of how nurses can use this information to care for PLWH, (c) how this might affect referral patterns (I usually refer this issue to the dietitian, do you recommend that nurses . . . ?), (d) consistent APA format for citations in the text.
Judge a little, educate a lot

- Focus on the manuscript – no > 3 hrs.
- Have a compassionate mind
- Reflect on how your words will be received
- Be a mentor

Make Recommendation:

- Your options are:
  - Accept
  - Needs Revisions
  - Reject
  - Support decision in your discussion of the manuscript

Style Guide & Author Instructions

Available at
http://www.nursesinaidscarejournal.org