

JCEPT Peer Review Form

Thank you for taking the time to review a manuscript for JCEPT! Reviews for JCEPT are conducted using the following process:

- Receive an invitation by the Associate Editor to review a manuscript
- Accept the invitation.
- Choose the peer review process you prefer: JCEPT offers either traditional double blind or open peer review options for our reviewers.
- Review the manuscript.
- Submit the complete online peer-review form within 2 weeks of accepting the invitation.
- You may be asked to review the revised manuscript.

JCEPT provides reviewers the opportunity to take part in an open peer review process. Open peer review removes reviewer anonymity and encourages more collegial conversations between authors and reviewers. JCEPT believes that open peer review coincides with its mission as it facilitates development of reviewers as well as authors interested in participating and submitting similar research. If both you and the author opt-in for the open-review process:

- The author will know who the reviewers are
- The review may be published as a peer-reviewed work, if published with the paper. For publication, degree, title & contact information will be required.

The default option will be the traditional double blinded review process. If you do not opt-in, your confidentiality will be maintained in the standard blinded review process.

- You can still receive anonymous credit for completing a review via [Publons](#).

1. **Overview:** Describe how the topic or method in this article is of potential interest to the JCEPT readership. How is the research original and impactful?

2. **Major Issues:** note any major flaws, issues, or deficiencies that could lead to rejection if the authors are not able to adequately address them. Such issues often include a weak rationale, flawed or incomplete methods, or incomplete or biased results.
3. **Minor issues:** The text overall should be clearly written and easily comprehensible. Identify or suggest changes that would improve the overall quality of the manuscript. Note any minor issues in:
 - Title: It should make clear the topic and manuscript type.
 - Abstract: Judge that the abstract accurately summarizes the manuscript and the main message without reading further. Note any specific deficiencies or suggest changes that the author can address.
 - Tables and Figures: The tables and figures should add to the understanding of the manuscript. Identify or suggest changes that would enhance clarity and understanding or reduce redundancy with the text.
 - References: The references should be sufficient, recent, and correctly formatted. Make note of any issues if present.
4. **Methodology:** The methodology should be clear, complete, supported by evidence, and appropriate for the purpose. Identify specific deficiencies if present.
5. **Rationale/Introduction:** The introduction should clearly build a strong and logical rationale to support the purpose of the manuscript. Suggest changes to improve the rationale if necessary.
6. **Results:** They should be completely reported without bias (e.g. findings interpreted in Results section). Identify any specific deficiencies.
7. **Discussion:** The discussion should be clear, thoughtful, and thorough with respect to the relevant literature. Suggest changes that would enhance clarity and understanding.
8. **Conclusion:** The submission's conclusion should be consistent with the evidence without overstating the impact.
9. Please indicate whether you would like to participate in JCEPT's Open Peer Review program.
 - I agree to an open peer review process
 - I do not agree to open peer review, my review will be double-blind
10. Please provide the Editorial Board with the following confidential information: **Your overall judgement of the value and interest of the content for the JCEPT audience**

11. Please provide the Editorial Board with the following confidential information: **What do you find the overall quality of the manuscript to be? (Note: only exceptional CATs will be accepted.)**

12. Please provide the Editorial Board with the following confidential information: **Any additional confidential comments that you would like to provide to the Associate Editor/Editors in Chief.**

13. Please provide the Editorial Board with the following confidential information: **Do you feel competent to assess the statistical analysis in this manuscript?**
 - Yes
 - No

14. Please provide the Editorial Board with the following confidential information: **Do you feel competent that the suggestions provided will be sufficient to improve the language in the manuscript?**
 - Yes
 - No