

# Guide for Reviewers

The *Journal of Healthcare Management (JHM)* is the official journal of the American College of Healthcare Executives. *JHM* publishes timely healthcare management articles that inform and guide executives, managers, educators, and researchers. *JHM* only considers research-based articles for peer review. Such articles should facilitate communication and discussion among executives, academics, and policymakers. The editor reads all submitted articles to determine suitability for the peer review process.

- Article reviews are double-blind. A double-blind review means that authors' and reviewers' identities are unknown to one another.
- Reviewers are asked to complete their reviews within 21 days.
- The quality of the journal and the articles appearing in it is dependent on our reviewers. To recognize our reviewers, the names of all individuals reviewing in a given year will appear the following year in the March/April issue and on the *JHM* website.

If you are interested in being a manuscript reviewer for *JHM*, please [send an e-mail](#) to Stephen O'Connor, editor, ([JHMeditor@uab.edu](mailto:JHMeditor@uab.edu)) indicating your interest along with your key areas of expertise.

## Guidelines to Consider in Developing Your Review

### *Introduction*

- Is it appropriate for this journal?
- Is the purpose of the article stated?
- Is the research question clear and appropriate?

### *Background/Literature review*

- Have the authors included the most relevant literature?
- Is it clear how this paper fits among the other studies done in this area?

### *Theoretical/Conceptual framework*

- Is there adequate and appropriate conceptual/theoretical background?
- Is there proper explanation of how and why the main variables relate to one another?

### *Methods*

- Given the research questions, did the author(s) employ the strongest approach?
- What kinds of limitations are imposed on the researchers by using this approach?
- Is there sufficient information given about the data collection procedures?
- Is there sufficient information given about the variables of interest?

### *Results*

- Are the results clear and statistically rigorous?

### *Discussion*

- Does the discussion flow logically from the results?
- Are the authors' conclusions appropriate given the results of their analysis?
- Do the authors discuss the limitations of the study?
- Do the authors include specific implications for healthcare management practice?

### *General comments*

- Do the authors avoid repetition, wordiness, or excessive use of jargon?
- What has been missed (literature, alternative interpretations of the data)?

When agreeing to review:

- Review papers in your area of expertise.
- Be sure that you have enough time to complete the review (which will be due 21 days later).

When writing your review:

- Be constructive and polite. Point out the solutions, not only problems.
- Be concise. Start with main issues—usual review length is 1 to 2 pages.
- Be structured. Number your comments, and cite page and line numbers.
- Be timely. Complete your review within appropriate time limits.

Manuscripts and reviews are submitted via the [PeerTrack](#) system. The PeerTrack review form asks you to do the following:

- Choose a recommendation term for the manuscript—Accept, Minor Revision, Revise and Resubmit, or Reject
- Provide an overall manuscript rating, 0 to 100, with 100 being the highest rating
- Rate the manuscript (1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the highest) on each of the following criteria—clarity of presentation, accuracy, originality, literature reviewed/cited, appropriateness of research methods, appropriateness of data analysis, appropriateness and usefulness of tables/figures, and relevance to policymakers/researchers/practitioners
- Provide confidential comments to the editor
- Provide comments (required) to the author(s)

## **About the *Journal of Healthcare Management***

*JHM* is what is known as a bridge or crossover journal, a type of journal that connects or bridges the research of primarily academic authors with a readership that is mostly healthcare management practitioners. These two distinct groups do not necessarily share similar objectives; however, they are inextricably linked by the field they share. Although bridge journals are important venues in applied, professional, and context-specific fields such as healthcare management, the format can present significant challenges to authors, reviewers, and editors. For instance, authors are expected to draw on the pertinent literature, use relevant theory to support hypotheses and research questions, and employ appropriate research methods. At the same time, the article must be relevant, appealing, and easily understood by the healthcare executives, consultants, and students who make up the majority of *JHM*'s readers.