

Guidelines for Journal of Voice manuscript reviewers: Rating a manuscript

There are two primary areas of concern when reviewing a manuscript, **Research** (the work itself) and **Writing** (how well the work is expressed). The **General Decision** (acceptance to rejection) is based on the consideration of both the Research and the Writing. To judge Research, Writing, and the General Decision, the reviewer needs to consider a number of suggested elements, offered below.

Reviewers are requested to specify a number between 0 and 100 for the Research and the Writing separately, where 0 is very poor and 100 is very excellent. The reviewer is also asked to specify one of the General Decision categories. The reviewer’s narrative should be consistent with his or her ratings. The reviewer can also indicate whether she or he would like to re-review the next version of the manuscript. Also, the reviewer is encouraged to highlight or prioritize, perhaps even list, the problems of the manuscript needing most attention, to help guide the authors to make their revision closer to publication-ready. A plagiarism tool is being considered by the Journal, but the reviewer should report any such instances that are detected.

1. Research rating elements [0 poor – 100 excellent, integer], combining two areas of review:

Worth to the field

- Importance or relevance of topic to profession and society
- Actual or potential impact and value of research and data to profession and society
- Novelty of the project compared to other publications
- Connection to our interdisciplinary fields / suitability of subject matter to Journal of Voice

Research “Mechanics”

- Soundness/correctness/defects/limitations of design, methodology, procedures, statistics
- Consistency/inconsistency of quality of all aspects of the project
- Clarity/understandability/confusion/unreadability of displays, schematics, figures, photographs, tables
- Accurate/sufficient/biased interpretation of results
- Nonfatal/fatal flaws and ease of “fixing” problems

2. Writing rating elements [0 poor – 100 excellent, integer]:

- Use of appropriate English – spelling, grammar, phrase and sentence construction, including level of clarity/ambiguity of English usage
- Clarity/confusion of ideas, definitions, procedures, participant instructions and responses
- Organization of elements of the manuscript
- Level of formal scientific writing style; infrequent use of idioms
- Ease of “fixing” English usage
- [Recommendation for supplemental editing of manuscript]

3. General decision and choice of “re-review”

1. Accept – no changes needed
2. Minor revision – adjustments are necessary but few, not critical to the results, and doable
3. Major revision – adjustments are necessary and critical for later acceptance
4. Reject – content is a mismatch to the journal, too flawed for further consideration, too redundant with what is already known, or deemed to be insufficiently important.
 - A. Re-review – manuscript needs to be reviewed again by reviewers once a revision is sent to the Journal

Sample “anchors”:

Fatal Flaws		Serious deficits		Numerous deficits		Publication questionable; needs important changes		Publishable work with minor changes		Publishable work with no changes needed
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

Please choose the following decision:

Accept: Manuscript is immediately recognizable as important research. Extremely well-written paper. The content provides valuable additions to the knowledge base in the field.

Minor Revision: The manuscript has no major flaws, and is recognizable as important research. There is valuable information for the field after some changes or revisions are made. Some parts need clarification. The paper may require edits of English usage and minor enhancements or alterations of data interpretation. Some sections may be weak and require revision for greater completeness or clarity.

Major Revision: The manuscript has major problems with manuscript organization, research design, methodology, representation of the results, interpretation of the results, or writing style and use of English. The paper will require substantial revisions and might possibly be sent back to reviewers for reevaluation, but all problems appear to be solvable.

Reject: The manuscript has fatal flaws in design, methods, interpretation, bias, or other areas, or the subject matter is not suitable for the Journal of Voice. The manuscript also may be rejected if the material is too redundant with existing literature, adds nothing new to the topic, or the topic is judged to be unimportant. The revisions that would be necessary to correct the problems with a manuscript in this category are likely to be too extreme to be performable in a reasonable amount of time.

Re-review: This category implies that an important revision is required and that a decision regarding publication of this manuscript should not be made until the reviewer has the opportunity to review the revised manuscript.