Thank you for your willingness to serve as a reviewer for JAACAP. The strength of the Journal and its impact in child and adolescent psychiatry relies on the rigorous and thoughtful review of manuscripts received by the journal for review. Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and is an essential component of formal scholarly communications.

Reviewers are invited by the action editors of JAACAP, including the editor-in-chief, associate editor, deputy editors, and occasionally an assistant or ad hoc editor. JAACAP utilizes a double-blind review process, which means that both the authors and reviewers are unknown to each other at all stages of the review process.

The following guidelines will assist invited reviewers in providing a comprehensive manuscript review.

Other resources include:

- JAACAP’s guide for authors
- ICMJE Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals
- COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

Title: Does it clearly describe the article? Is it a reasonable length?

Abstract: Is the abstract structured into the following sections (Objective, Method, Results, and Conclusions)? Per ICMJE recommendations, the abstract “should provide the context or background for the study and should state the study’s purpose, basic procedures (selection of study participants, settings, measurements, analytical methods), main findings (giving specific effect sizes and their statistical and clinical significance, if possible), and principal conclusions. It should emphasize new and important aspects of the study or observations, note important limitations, and not overinterpret findings.”

For clinical trials, is the clinical trial registration information provided?

Body of Manuscript: The manuscript should be divided into the following sections: Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion.

Introduction: Does the introduction accurately describe what the authors hope to achieve and clearly state the question under investigation?

Method: Does the author accurately explain how the data were collected? Is the design suitable for answering the question posed? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the equipment and materials been adequately described? Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded and has the author been precise in describing the measurements?

Reporting Guidelines: Have the authors followed the appropriate study reporting guidelines and included relevant information and materials? Good sources for reporting guidelines are the EQUATOR Network and NLM’s Research Reporting Guidelines and Initiatives.
Results: Does the author explain what was discovered in the research? Is the finding clearly laid out and in a logical sequence? Have the appropriate analyses been conducted? Are the statistical analyses correct? Is an additional in-depth statistical analysis required?

Discussion: Are the claims in this section supported by the research? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the discussion contain the clinical relevance and limitation of the research? Does the discussion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?

Figures and Tables: Do the figures and tables inform the reader and play an important role in describing the research findings? Do the figures describe the data accurately?

References: Is the reference selection judicious and appropriate? Are the references accurate? Identify any relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors.

Language: Is the article grammatically correct and well written? If you feel that the article can benefit from an English polishing service, bring this to the editor’s attention.

Ethical Issues
Plagiarism: JAACAP screens for potential plagiarism with iThenticate. If you suspect that an article is or contains portions that are substantially copied from another work, let the editor know, citing the work in as much detail as possible.

Confidentiality and Humane Treatment: Does the article indicate whether the procedures followed have been assessed by the responsible review committee (institutional and national), or if no formal ethics committee is available, were in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration? If the article describes a particular patient, has the confidentiality of the patient been maintained?

Fraud and misconduct: If you suspect the results in an article to be untrue or manipulated in some way, bring this to the editor’s attention or note it in your review.

Peer Review Scoring Criteria
Peer review quality will be assessed by the editors and assigned a score based on the following criteria:

i. **90 Outstanding**: Clear review of the manuscript and the study it describes. Comments to the editor are concise, insightful and accurate. Comments to the authors demonstrate a clear understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript and revisions based on these suggestions will significantly improve the manuscript.

ii. **80 Excellent**: Good review of the manuscript. Comments to the editor are thoughtful and accurate. Comments to the authors demonstrate a good understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. Revisions based on most of these suggestions will improve the manuscript. Occasional suggestion unclear or of minor importance.

iii. **70 Helpful**: Adequate review of the manuscript but review lacking in detail. Comments to the editor do not clearly define the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. Comments to the authors are confusing and/or miss the big picture and dwell on minor facets of the manuscript or study.

iv. **60 Marginal**: Review missed the key strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript/study. Comments to the editor are of limited value in aiding in the editorial decision. Comments to the authors do not adequately assess the manuscript or offer useful suggestions for revisions to improve the manuscript.

v. **50 Not helpful**: Review of the manuscript superficial. Comments to the editors are arbitrary and unsupported. Comments to the authors are very negative and do not suggest opportunities for revision.

vi. **40 Poor**: Reviewer clearly needs direction. Comments to the editor are of limited value at best in evaluating the manuscript. Comments to the authors are not helpful and at times too critical or inconsistent.

vii. **30 Unacceptable**: Review is completely un-helpful and/or counterproductive. Don’t use this reviewer again.

*****
Continuing Medical Education (CME) Credit for JAACAP Manuscript Reviewers

JAACAP reviewers are able to earn AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™ for their work reviewing manuscripts. Through an objective and thorough review of submitted manuscripts, reviewers will increase their knowledge and skills in their field of expertise and acquire new information and technology that can be applied to their clinical practice and/or research. The incorporation of a continuing medical education (CME) process into the manuscript review process provides the opportunity to educate the reviewers (as learners) in the manuscript review process as well. In this manuscript review activity, the editors assume the role of program directors/moderators and identify the learners by selecting the appropriate reviewer based on their expertise and/or clinical experience. Once a review is completed, the editors score that review. These scores, as well as the number of late and declined reviews, are used as an oversight method to ensure the quality of reviews.

Learning Objectives
The process of reviewing manuscripts for publication requires specific skills and knowledge, both as a reviewer and in the content area of the manuscript itself. Engaging in the review process may require the physician reviewer to learn new skills or fortify existing expertise in order to complete the review process effectively.

Upon completion of this educational activity, participants should be able to:
1. Improve knowledge of current issues and developments in the area of child and adolescent psychiatry.
2. Increase skills in performing critical analyses of the medical literature.

Target Audience
Child and adolescent psychiatrists and physicians in related specialties who review manuscripts submitted to JAACAP for possible publication.

Accreditation
The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education to provide continuing medical education for physicians. The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry designates this manuscript review activity for 3 AMA PRA Category 1 Credits™.

Awarding CME
In January of each year, the JAACAP Editorial Office tallies the number of successfully completed reviews from the previous year. Reviews that received a score of 30 or less (using the criteria outlined above) are deemed unacceptable, and will not merit AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™. Three credits are awarded for each manuscript review scoring above 30. Reviewers who complete five or more reviews receive no more than 15 credits. Each reviewer who has completed at least one acceptable review during the previous calendar year will be invited to participate in an evaluation activity and claim their CME credits. Late and declined reviews will not be eligible for CME credit.

*****

Reviewer Access to the JAACAP Editorial Manager Site
Editorial Manager (EM) is JAACAP’s web-based manuscript submission, review, and tracking system. Use your existing Username and Password to log in to the system; you may need to use the “Role” drop down menu at the top of the page to switch from your Author or Editor role to your Reviewer role. Please contact support@jaacap.org if you are unsure whether you are already registered or if you encounter problems accessing the system.

Initial Requirements for Reviewers
There are two vital and easy tasks we ask you to complete immediately:

First, log in to EM as described above. This will take you to your Reviewer Main Menu. At the top of the screen, click the “Update My Information” link. Confirm that your contact information is correct and update any information as needed.

*Please note, the email address saved in your EM profile is the one to which we will send invitations to review.
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Second, scroll down to the **Areas of Interest or Expertise** section. This will open a pop-up window listing various subject areas. Please select the classifications appropriate for your expertise. Note that there are two sections to the list: Topics and Methods. You may select classifications from both sections, as appropriate. These classifications are used to match reviewers with manuscripts.

Optional: Add your unique **ORCID identifier** to your user profile. If you don’t already have an ORCID identifier, **register now**.

**Reviewer Invitation to Review**

If you are selected as a potential reviewer, you will receive an invitation letter by email containing the abstract of the blinded manuscript you are invited to review. **Within 5 days** of receiving the invitation, please log in to EM and **accept or decline** the invitation.

To accept the invitation to review, click the Accept link provided in the invitation letter. You may also accept the invitation to review by logging in to EM as described above. Click on “New Reviewer Invitations” and select **Accept**. Please **complete the review within 21 days**. Late and declined reviews will not be eligible for CME credit.

To decline the invitation to review, click the Decline link provided in the invitation letter. You will then be offered an opportunity to provide a brief explanation as to why you are unable to perform the review and to suggest alternate reviewers.

Once you agree to review, you will be able to open or download the full manuscript from EM as a PDF (be sure to enable pop-ups for the site). Either method will allow you to print the file. Please bear in mind that all review materials must be treated as confidential documents.

Please **contact the Editorial Office** immediately if you have a personal, professional, or financial conflict of interest with respect to the content of the manuscript or with the author(s) that would impair your ability to provide a fair and unbiased review. Beginning in 2017, you will be asked formally to report any disclosures when you submit your completed review. See below for more information.

**Submitting Your Reviewer Comments and Recommendations**

To post your recommendation and comments to the author and editor follow these steps:

Log in to EM following the instructions above. Click on “Pending Assignments” and then select **Submit Recommendation** from the action options on the left. The instructions below will help you navigate submitting a review in EM. The guidelines on the next page can assist you in providing a comprehensive review.

**Select your recommendation from the pull-down menu** at the top of the screen and complete all three segments of the review form. The first segment allows you to **quantitatively rate the paper** and will not be shared with the authors.

In the second segment, **Reviewer Blind Comments to Author**, please begin your review for the author with a general impression, summarizing the important aspects of the manuscript. Please number the specific comments so the author can clearly respond to each of your concerns. Refrain from ever being caustic: derisive words and ad hominem comments have no place in a review. Authors are exquisitely sensitive to the language and the content of the reviews they receive from the *Journal*. Your critique may make a genuine contribution to the research report and may influence the author’s future efforts, as well. Finally, do **not** make a recommendation regarding acceptance of the manuscript in the Comments to Author; that is a matter for you to convey in the third, confidential segment.

The Editorial Office strongly suggests that when you are reviewing a manuscript you do **not** compose your comments to the author online directly in EM. Rather, compose your comments in a word processing program, save them, and then copy and paste them into EM. EM has a feature that allows you to save a partially completed review and return to
complete it later. However, if you encounter technical difficulties and lose your internet connection before saving your work, it will be lost. There is no automatic back-up function in EM.

In the third segment, **Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor**, feel free to communicate without restraint, stating any issues you would like to share with the editor. These may include, for example, concerns about plagiarism, conflict of interest, or scientific misconduct. Your comments to the author will be compiled and shared with the author through EM; your comments to the editor will be visible only to the editor.

Finally, once you have completed all three segments of the review form, click “Proceed.” You will then have the opportunity to review your recommendation and comments. Select **Submit Recommendation** when you are ready to send your review to the editor. You will receive a confirmation email once your review has been successfully submitted, and you will also receive a blinded copy of the resulting decision letter once it has been sent to the corresponding author.

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to, or discussed with others, except as authorized by the editor. Following your review, please destroy any print or electronic copies of the manuscript.

**Conflict of Interest:** When reviews are submitted, reviewers will be asked to report any and all possible conflicts of interests, financial or otherwise, including direct or indirect financial or personal relationships, interests, and affiliations, whether or not directly related to the subject of the paper, that have occurred over the last two years, or that are expected in the foreseeable future. Disclosure includes, but is not limited to, grants or research funding, employment, affiliations, patents (in preparation, filed, or granted), inventions, speakers’ bureaus, honoraria, consultancies, royalties, stock options/ownership, or expert testimony. If there are no conflicts of interest to declare, this must be stated explicitly. This information will be shared with the editors alongside the completed review for evaluation, but will not be shared with the authors.

**Contact and Resources**
The JAACAP Editorial Office is the initial and primary contact for user support. You may contact us by email at support@jaacap.org or by phone at 202.966.7300, ext. 153.

If you are unable to serve as a reviewer for a period longer than 2 weeks, please log in to EM, click the “Update My Information” link, click on “Unavailable Dates” and follow the online instructions to alert the Editorial Office to your unavailability. You may also alert the Editorial Office.

Refer to JAACAP’s complete **guide for authors** for additional information.