



# The Journal of Haemophilia Practice

[www.haemjournal.com](http://www.haemjournal.com)

---

## INFORMATION FOR REVIEWERS

In this document:

- **The review process**
- **Providing feedback**
- **Reviewer recognition**

*The Journal of Haemophilia Practice* depends on a valued network of reviewers who volunteer their time to help assess the quality of the manuscripts we receive. Through peer review, we seek experts' fair, honest and unbiased opinion of a manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.

We invite experts with subject-specific knowledge in all aspects of bleeding disorders care to peer review for the journal and, where relevant, others whose specialisms touch on research topics presented by the manuscripts we receive. We aim to include experts from relevant disciplines from all over the world.

### The review process

*The Journal of Haemophilia Practice's* peer review process and the guidance we provide to reviewers is based on best practice outlined by the [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors](#) (ICJME) and the Committee on Publication Ethics' (COPE) [Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#).

The peer review process is managed via the journal's ScholarOne portal. When we need your expert opinion on a manuscript, you will receive an email inviting you to review which will include the abstract of the manuscript concerned. Your decision to accept or decline should be submitted via the portal. If you do not feel able to review the manuscript, you may wish to suggest an alternative reviewer. You should only agree to review a manuscript if you feel qualified to do so, and you should let us know if you think you have a conflict of interest.

*The Journal of Haemophilia Practice* has a double-blind peer review process: you will not be informed of the identity of the authors or the second reviewer, and the authors and second reviewer will not be informed of your identity. Manuscripts remain the private property of the

authors; reviewers are expected to keep the contents of the manuscripts they review confidential.

We generally ask that reviews are completed within four weeks. However, we understand that this timeframe may not always be realistic and can offer flexibility with deadlines for feedback.

## **Providing feedback**

In the ScholarOne portal, you will be asked to complete a series of short questionnaires on the manuscript you have been asked to review. These comprise general questions on the manuscript and its structure, interest, quality and originality. You will also have the opportunity to provide detailed feedback to the authors and, if appropriate, confidential comments to the editor-in-chief.

We ask that reviewer feedback is critical but constructive, specific, and makes suggestions for revisions or corrective actions. If you think that the results of a study are poorly analysed, for example, please say why. You should also be clear on which are the major issues that need to be addressed and which are minor. All of this helps the editor-in-chief to clearly understand the basis for your recommendation and helps authors to identify where their manuscript needs to be improved.

We invite reviewers to review for us because they have relevant expertise – so, if you agree to undertake a review for us, please don't be shy. While criticism should be fair and respectful of the authors, it is important to us that we know your expert opinion.

## **Reviewer recognition**

Through peer review, we seek experts' fair, honest and unbiased opinion of a manuscript's strengths and weaknesses. This is invaluable to *The Journal of Haemophilia Practice* and we appreciate the time and expertise that is generously given by those who agree to review for us.

To acknowledge the contribution, *The Journal of Haemophilia Practice* has partnered with PUBLONS, which supports the recognition of peer reviewing as a research output. All those who review for the journal have the option to receive PUBLONS Reviewer Recognition.