**Peer Review Guidelines | *The Journal of Global Health***

*The Journal of Global Health* relies on the scientific research community to assess both the validity and scientific merit of articles under consideration and ultimately improve manuscripts deemed suitable for publication. Please accept an invitation only if you have the time, knowledge, and objectivity required to submit an unbiased assessment of the manuscript. If you feel you are not able to review the article, we would sincerely appreciate a recommendation of another qualified reviewer.

By agreeing to review the article, reviewers agree to keep manuscripts and correspondence confidential and to declare any competing interests. We ask reviewers to complete the review within 3 weeks of accepting the invitation. Reviewers may be asked to review a revised version of the manuscript following resubmission by authors.

The Journal follows a double-blind peer review process to facilitate unbiased reviews and to protect the anonymity of reviewers. Reviewers may choose to sign their reviews following publication and receive credit via Publons. Please credit any collaborators in the comments to the editor section and ensure the review comments to be delivered to authors do not contain identifying information.

The review comments should be include the following bolded sections and reference specific line numbers (if applicable):

- **Summary** - Explain how the manuscript is original and impactful.
- **Major Issues** - Note any major areas of concern the authors must address.
    a. Major issues include but are not limited to: weak rationale, flawed or incomplete methods, ethical concerns, or incomplete or biased results.
- **Minor Issues** - Note any issues that could detract from the manuscript's clarity. Suggest any changes that would improve the manuscript's quality. Please refrain from suggesting copy edits.

Please also provide the Editorial Board with the following confidential information in the comments to the editor:

- Your evaluation of the manuscript's overall quality and ultimate recommendation for the manuscript.
- Any additional comments you would like to provide.
- If you feel competent to assess the statistical analysis of the manuscript.
- If you feel that the suggestions provided will be sufficient to improve the writing of the manuscript.

The manuscript should fulfill the criteria outlined below for each section (if applicable). Note any specific issues present, and suggest how the authors may improve upon them.

**Title** - The title should clearly indicate the topic and major findings/conclusion of the article.

**Abstract** - The abstract should accurately summarize the manuscript and its significant findings.

**Methodology** - The methodology should be appropriate for the manuscript type, easy to understand, and supported by evidence.

**Introduction** - The introduction should build a strong and logical rationale with sufficient background information to support the purpose of the manuscript.

**Results** - The results should be unbiased with no interpretation of the findings in the Results section.

**Discussion** - The discussion should be thoughtful, thorough, and easily comprehensible.

**Conclusion (if applicable)** - The conclusion should be consistent with the evidence.

**Tables and Figures** - All tables and figures should be clear and necessary and should enhance the manuscript.

**References** - The references should be sufficient, relevant, and correctly formatted.

Specific help in using our review submission platform may be found [here](here).