



## Submission Review Management Help

## OIDA IJSD Journal / OIDA ICSD Conference

## Preview Review Fields

[Preview Form](#)[Add New Field](#)[List Fields](#)[Delete Field](#)[Change Field Order](#)**Referee Guide: The Reviewing Criteria - Please provide if you considered other criteria**

Comments and critical suggestions on the content and structure of this referee format are most welcome. Please email Neville Hewage, [nhewage@ontariointernational.org](mailto:nhewage@ontariointernational.org)

Dear Referee,

This is an important role. You belong to a community of scholars, educators and practitioners who provide critical and constructive feedback on the work to their peers. Referees will be credited as Associate Editors for the volume of the *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development* in which they have contributed (although, of course, the particular papers they refereed will not be identified).

Your review and comments will be shared with authors in order to improve quality of the publication.

**The Role of the Referee**

Please observe carefully the following guidelines on the role of the referee.

**1. Expertise**

Papers are not always sent to a referee whose field is identical to the subject matter of that paper. You don't have to be precisely qualified in a field to be a constructive referee. In fact, an excellent paper will speak beyond its narrowly defined field. If, however, a paper is so distant from your field that you do not feel qualified to judge its merits, please return it to the publishing manager for the journal, who will locate another referee.

**2. Confidentiality**

Referees receive unpublished work, which must be treated as confidential until published. They should destroy all electronic and printed copies of the draft paper and referee report once they have received confirmation that their reports have been received by the publishing manager (in case we can't open the report files you send us). Referees must not disclose to others which papers they have refereed; nor are they to share those papers with any other person.

**3. Conflict of Interest**

Referees must declare any conflict of interest or any other factor which may affect their independence—in cases for instance, where they have received a paper of a colleague or an intellectual opponent. In cases of conflict of interest, please notify the publishing manager of your inability to referee a particular paper.

**4. Intellectual Merit**

A paper must be judged on its intellectual merits alone. Personal criticism or criticism based solely on the political or social views of the referee, is not acceptable.

**5. Full Explanation**

Critical or negative judgments must be fully supported by detailed reference to evidence from the paper under review or other relevant sources.

**6. Plagiarism and Copyright**

If a referee considers that a paper may contain plagiarism or that it might breach another party's copyright, they should notify the publishing manager for the journal, providing the relevant citations to support their claim.

**7. Responsiveness**

Referees are asked to return their reports within two weeks. This assists us to provide rapid feedback to the author.

**Editorial Quality**

The refereeing process for publication in the Journal is a rigorous measure of the quality of content. Authors are expected to revise to the standards required of the more negative of the referee reports they receive. For instance, if one referee recommends 'resubmit with major revisions' and another 'resubmit with minor revisions', the author is expected to resubmit with major revisions.

**Please evaluate using percentages (%). Eg: 20%, 80%, 90%, 92.8% etc. , Yes/No, Not Applicable (N/A). If necessary may add additional comments on each sections and final section of the report.**

**English**

Manuscripts must be clearly and concisely written in English. The Editors/Reviewers reserve the right to reject without review those that cannot adequately be assessed because of a poor standard of English. Authors whose first language is not English are encouraged to have their manuscript checked by a native English speaker.

**Decision Making Process**

There is often not a sharp separation between the role of editor and the role of reviewer. Where reviewers disagree, for example, it may fall to the editor to make a judgement in the light of conflicting advice.

The meaning of peer review can be extended to include not only pre-publication decision-making, but also post-publication assessment. For example, in the social sciences in recent years there has been a great deal of interest in the extent to which reported statistical findings can be replicated by other researchers. With the growing availability of electronic databases, original data can now be made available to other researchers to provide a check and assessment of published findings. Similarly, review articles surveying a particular sub-field may well make a contribution to the assessment of a particular piece of work.

Peer review is practised in many different ways by journals in humanities and social sciences. Differences cover such matters as pre-screening before sending to referees, participation by editors themselves in the process of assessment, who makes the final decision and whether authors remain anonymous.

### Structure

The research process follows three stages (Maxwell and Delaney, 2004): conceptual, methodological, and statistical. Science conveys a conceptual world (linked to theories and research hypothesis) and an empirical world (linked to observations and data). The connection between these two worlds is achieved by the method (linked to the hypothesis and able to obtain data that can contrast them). Combining this idea, along with the ideas developed in the American Psychological Association (APA) publication manual (2001), and the empirical review on the reviewing process of Beyer *et al.* (1995) and Gilliland and Cortina (1997), it can be concluded that theoretical components (introduction and discussion), experimental design (the method section) and the results section are essential for the review process.

### Validity

The validity theory, recently reviewed by Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2001), indicates that research conclusions can be seriously questioned by a series of validity threats. The value of the first part of the paper, included in the conceptual stage, relies on the validity of construct, that is, the reasons that may produce incorrect inferences on the construct explored in the study. Here we include problems with the definition of the construct, or with empirical definitions linked to the construct. The value of the design, included in the methodological level, depends on two types of validity: internal (why the inferences on the effect of a given independent variable can be incorrect?), and external (how the inferences can be generalized across populations, contexts, etc?). The control of relevant variables and the sampling of research units are the most important factors of this stage. The value of the two last sections, results analysis and discussion, should be based on the statistical validity (why inferences from statistical analysis can be incorrect?). Problems with the analysis assumptions (*e.g.*, homogeneity of variances, sphericity, etc.) may increase the probability of Type I error particularly when increasing the number of contrasts. Designing experiments is a two-stage activity: structural (statistical design) and strategic (manipulation and control of variables). These stages are connected by the plan of the research, where the problem under investigation is stated explicitly (Ramos *et al.*, 2004).

Some journals that evaluated their editorial policy (Beyer *et al.*, 1995) have concluded that relevance-originality-novelty, technical and conceptual quality, and the suitability for the journal are the principal edges of a good reviewing process. In a similar approach, for Gilliland and Cortina (1997) the main edges were: design, method adequacy, theoretical and statistical quality, background literature, construct development, and writing style. In agreement with these ideas, we have reordered the items in our clusters, and added new items: writing style and suitability.

Also, we think that new experimental techniques (for example, Internet-based experiments) open a huge number of research opportunities, but also a great number of validity threats, so, we have added some items in agreement with the proposals of Birnbaum (2000) on Internet-based experimentation, and Shadish (2002) on field experiments. Finally, in a recent revision, items were reorganized following three criteria: (1) the suggestions of reviewers who had used these items and (2) those of typical educational guide oriented to doctorate and post-graduate students.

### Final Report

Final report is a collection of recommendations and criteria for guiding manuscript writing and evaluation. The guide is composed of eight clusters: a) General, b) Literature antecedents and research rationale, c) Theoretical development, d) Experimental Design, e) Results, f) Interpretation of the results, g) Manuscript writing, h) Documentation sources.

Most items are written as an affirmative question, in which a parenthetical statement clarifies the evaluated content. Also, most items can be answered in a **YES/NO** fashion. Almost all items are useful for evaluating experimental and experimental research, so we will discriminate between them only if necessary. If question is not applicable; states as **N/A**.

### Additional Important Notes:

Three types of criteria are included in each cluster.

(a) First, the items with **one asterisk “ \* ”** (basic items) have to be fulfilled completely in order to accept the paper.

(b) Second, the items with “+” symbol have to be used when evaluating the technical quality of the manuscript; especial attention must be paid to the design and statistical analysis.

(C) Third, the items without marks are complementary, and can be used for evaluating the general quality of the manuscript.

Only papers with a high mark in the three types of criteria should be considered for publication.

Thank you

I look forward to receiving your review.

Regards

Neville Hewage

Managing Editor

OIDA IJSD Journal

### References:

1. American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
2. Beyer, J.M., Chanove, R.G., and Fox, W.B. (1995). The review process and the fates of manuscripts submitted to AMJ. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1219-1260.
3. Birnbaum, M.H. (Ed.) (2000). *Psychological experiments on the Internet*. San Diego: Academic Press.
4. Bobenrieth, M.A. (2002). Normas para revisión de artículos originales en Ciencias de la Salud. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 2, 509-523.
5. Botella, J. and Gambara, H. (2006). Doing and reporting a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 6, 425-440.
6. Bucla-Casal, G. and Sierra, J.C. (2002). Normas para la redacción de casos clínicos. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 2, 525-532.
7. Campion, M.A. (1993). Article review checklist: A criterion checklist for reviewing research articles. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 705-718.
8. Carretero-Dios, H. y Pérez, C. (2007). Standards for the development and review of instrumental studies: Considerations about test selection in psychological research. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 7, 863-882.
9. Chow, S.L. (1998). Précis of statistical significance: Rationale, validity, and utility. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21, 169-239.
10. Estes, W.K. (1991). *Statistical models in behavioral research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
11. Faden, R.R., Beauchamp, T.L., and King, N.N. (1986). *A history and theory of informed consent*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
12. Gilliland, S.W. and Beckstein, B.A. (1996). Procedural and distributive justice in the editorial review process. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 669-691.
13. Gilliland, S.W. and Cortina, J.M. (1997). Reviewer and editor decision making in the journal review process. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 427-452.

14. Gore, S.M, Jones, G., and Thompson, S.G. (1992). The Lancet's statistical review process: Areas for improvement by authors. *The Lancet*, 340, 100-102.
15. Hadjistavropoulos, T. and Bieling, P.J. (2000). When reviews attack: Ethics, free speech, and the peer-review process. *Canadian Psychology*, 41, 152-159.
16. Harris, R.J. (1994). *ANOVA: An analysis of variance primer*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock. Insightful, Inc. (2008). *S-Plus, Release 8*. www.insightful.com
17. Judd, C.M. and McClelland, G.H. (1989). *Data analysis: A model comparison approach*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
18. Judd, C.M., McClelland, G.H., and Culhane, S.E. (1995). Data analysis: Continuing issues in the everyday analysis of psychological data. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 46, 433-465.
19. Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and analysis. A researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
20. Maxwell, S. E. and Delaney, H. D. (2004). *Designing experiments and analyzing data: A model comparison perspective* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
21. Minitab, Inc. (2008). *MINITAB (Statistical software). Release 15*. www.minitab.com
22. Ramos-Álvarez, M.M. and Catena, A. (2004). Normas para la elaboración y revisión de artículos originales experimentales en Ciencias del Comportamiento. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 4, 173-189.
23. Ramos, M.M., Catena, A., and Trujillo, H.M. (2004). *Manual de métodos y técnicas de investigación en ciencias del comportamiento*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
24. Ramos-Álvarez, M.M., Valdés-Conroy, B., and Catena, A. (2006). Criteria of the peer-review process for publication of experimental and quasiexperimental research in Psychology. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 6, 773-787.
25. Shadish, W.R. (2002). Revisiting field experimentation: Field notes for the future. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 3-18.
26. Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., and Campbell, D.T. (2001). *Experimental and Quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inferences*. Berkeley: Houghton Mifflin.
27. StatSoft, Inc. (2008). *Statistica (data analysis software system), Release 8*. www.statsoft.com
28. The R Project (2008). *R Project*. www.r-project.org
29. Virués-Ortega, J. and Moreno-Rodríguez, R. (2008). Guidelines for clinical case reports in behavioural clinical Psychology. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 8, 765-777.
30. Wilkinson, L., and the Task Force on Statistical Inference (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals: Guidelines and Explanations. *American Psychologist*, 54, 594-604.

#### (A) General (beliefs about the general quality of the manuscript after a reading) \*

##### Significance of Themes

- Is this a topic that needs addressing? Is the area investigated by the paper: timely? important? in need of addressing because it has been neglected? intrinsically interesting? filling a gap in current knowledge? (The paper does not have to be all of these things to be significant; it is sufficient to measure it against one of these forms of significance.)
- By addressing these themes, does this paper make a useful contribution? Is it itself significant?

A-1 - What is the strongest point of the manuscript?

A-2 - What is the weight (0-100) of the A1 point? (0: you think that the point is positive, but can be suppressed of the paper without loss; 100: you think that this is a core for the paper).

A-3 - What is the weakest point of the manuscript?

A-4 - What is the weight (0-100) of the A3 point? (0: you think the point is completely negligible; 100: you think the point makes the paper non publishable).

A-5 - Suitability of the manuscript? (The topic is interesting for the general reader of the journal, and it will be frequently cited, or, by the contrary, can have interest for a scarce number of potential readers).

#### (B). Antecedents and motivation of the research (Introduction section) \*

##### Relationship to Literature (Part 1)

- Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the current literature in the field?
- Does it connect with the literature in a way which might be useful to the development of our understanding in the area it addresses?

B-1. \* Is the description of the research problem clearly stated? (The main goal of the research is clearly stated at the beginning of the paper. The reader should not have to work out a lot in order to determine what the research question is).

B-2. \* Is there enough background literature to justify the importance of the research problem? (According to the literature, is the research question a major or a minor one?).

B-3. \* If the research problem has been solved, can the paper guide future research? (Is there a literature agreement on the importance of the research question?).

B-4. Is the theoretical frame clearly stated? (The research problem should be embedded within the theory and not stated merely on empirical terms).

B-5. Are the empirical referents of the problem clearly stated? (The rationale should be based on a clear sequence of effects-data).

B-6. Is the writing of the manuscript coherent? (The reading of the manuscript should follow a clear and coherent course and not moving from point to point without apparent connection between ideas. Introduction should be from general to specific).

### (C). Theoretical considerations (Introduction section)

#### Relationship to Literature (Part 2)

- Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the current literature in the field?
- Does it connect with the literature in a way which might be useful to the development of our understanding in the area it addresses?

---

C-1. \* Are the hypotheses/research questions clearly stated and is well justified? (Hypotheses/Research Questions should be based on a clearly stated theory and not empirically based only).

C-2. \* Does the hypothesis/Research question follow from the theory? (Hypotheses should be derived from the rationale).

C-3. \* Is the hypothesis/research questions a causal one?

C-4. \*Are there clear empirical predictions derived from the hypothesis?

C-5. \* Is the conceptual system relevant? (Constructs and concepts should be clearly related and relevant to the research problem).

C-6. \* Is there a presentation of alternative points of view on the research problem? (The manuscript should not be centred on author's beliefs).

C-7. Is the cited literature coherent with the manuscript's theoretical foundation?

C-8. \* Is there some theoretical originality in the manuscript? (Is the manuscript based on other authors' predictions?).

### (D). Experimental design (Method section) \*

#### Research Design and Data

- Has the research, or equivalent intellectual work upon which the paper is based, been well designed?
- Does the paper demonstrate adequate use of evidence, informational input or other intellectual raw materials in support of its case?

---

D-1. \* Ethics. Is there a clear statement on subjects' rights (for example, according to Helsinki declaration)?

\* Animals: Statements on their treatment and suffering.

\* Humans: All research with humans must obtain informed consent (Faden, Beauchamp, and King, 1986).

\* Group activities: Have the number of sessions been optimized to obtain the group activities benefits? Are all the participants (including the control conditions) going to receive the benefits of the activities?

D-2. \* Is the method section complete and properly organized? (Participants, instruments, design, procedure, etc.). Experimental units, instruments, apparatus, features, and procedure should be described up to a degree to allow replication.

D-3. \* Is the hypothesis/research questions testable? The hypothesis/research question must contain clear predictions on the direction of the results.

D-4. \* From a structural point of view: Are the independent variables adequate to contrast the hypothesis/Research question?

· For each independent variable: The selected levels must be well described (number, spacing between levels and range of the variable).

· For factorial designs: When using a complete factorial, all conditions should be included and, if some experimental conditions are omitted, there should be a clear justification of why.

D-5. \* For dependent variables: Keeping in mind the measurement instruments, are the important properties of the variable (sensitivity, reliability, and validity) adequate?