



KUFA JOURNAL FOR NURSING SCIENCES

Published By

UNIVERSITY OF KUFA- FACULTY OF NURSING

Peer Review Guideline

Introduction:

All manuscripts submitted to the Kufa Journal for Nursing Sciences are subjected to double-blind peer review process to ensure unbiased comments, constructive feedback, and informed decisions. Peer reviewers are expected to provide objective evaluation to ensure the quality of scientific papers published in the Journal.

Review Policy

Peer review is an objective process that play a vital role in maintaining the high publishing standards and ensuring the quality of scientific papers published in the Kufa Journal of Nursing Sciences. The journal policy is to use double-blind peer review process to ensure unbiased comments, feedback, and informed decisions for the manuscript. The decision of editors relies significantly on the comments and recommendations of Peer reviewers. Therefore, the peer-review guideline of the journal helps to clarify most of the queries regarding peer review manuscripts. It enables reviewers to complete their review report in thorough and timely manner to help publishing a submitted manuscript as quick as possible.

Notes to Peer Reviewers

1. Reviewers are strongly recommended to complete the review process in a timely manner.
2. Reviewers are expected to keep manuscript information confidential.
3. Experts are expected to accept and do the peer review if it is related to their areas of expertise.
4. Peer reviewers are expected to declare any conflicts of interest (financial, personal, or professional).
5. The Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers (COPE) should be considered before accepting the review.
6. Reviewers are expected to provide objective and constructive comments and feedback.



KUFA JOURNAL FOR NURSING SCIENCES

Published By

UNIVERSITY OF KUFA- FACULTY OF NURSING

Competing interests (COPE Guideline, pp 5 - 6)

Ensure you declare all potential competing, or conflicting, interests. If you are unsure about a potential competing interest that may prevent you from reviewing, do raise this. Competing interests may be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious in nature. If you are currently employed at the same institution as any of the authors or have been recent (eg, within the past 3 years) mentors, mentees, close collaborators or joint grant holders, you should not agree to review. In addition, you should not agree to review a manuscript just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting a review, or agree to review a manuscript that is very similar to one you have in preparation or under consideration at another journal.

Bias and competing interests

It is important to remain unbiased by considerations related to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, origins of a manuscript or by commercial considerations. If you discover a competing interest that might prevent you from providing a fair and unbiased review, notify the journal and seek advice (eg, see COPE Case 15-05: Reviewer requests to be added as an author after publication) (<https://COPE.onl/case-author>). While waiting for a response, refrain from looking at the manuscript and associated material in case the request to review is rescinded. Similarly, notify the journal as soon as possible if you find you do not have the necessary expertise to assess the relevant aspects of a manuscript so as not to unduly delay the review process. In the case of double blind review, if you suspect the identity of the author(s) notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential competing or conflict of interest.



REVIEWERS' GUIDE

Reviewers are expected to provide objective comments based on the elements of each aspect of the following guideline:

1. The Topic of the Article

- The topic of the article is important and make an evident contribution to the field
- The topic is a good fit for the journal.

2. Manuscript Title

- How do you rate the title of the manuscript?
- Appropriate and clear
- Appropriate but not clear
- Clear but not appropriate
- Not appropriate and not clear

3. Abstract

- Abstract include adequate information that represent and summarize the article's major points of the topic

4. Introduction

- Does the introduction include relevant information and background about the topic?

5. Methods and Materials

- Are the methods section clear and applicable?
- Does this section include important methodology steps?
- Doe the used statistical analyses appropriate to the research?
- Does the order of the described methods match the order of the generated results?

6. Results

- Do the results described in this paper novel?
- Does the author/s reported only relevant results?
- Do the reported results match the methods described by the author/s?



7. Discussion

- Matching: Do the reported findings in this section correlate with the results section?
- Interpretation: Does the author interpret what the results mean?
- Implications: Does that author describe why the recent results matter?

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

- Does the reported conclusion relevant to the results?
- Does the author explain the meaning of results beyond what they statistically mean?
- If applicable; does the conclusion include short-term and/or long-term implications of the findings?

9. Tables and Figures

- If applicable; do the provided tables and /or figures clear and relevant?
- Do the provided tables and/or figures include unnecessary details or modifications?

10. References and Citation

- Do the included references in the reference list as well as in the text follow the correct reference style followed by the author?

11. Additional Reviewer's Comments

- Does the paper raise any ethical or writing concerns? Yes – no

12. Competing Interest Disclosure

- I have no competing interest to disclose (personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious in nature). Competing conflict or interest can be found in Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers (COPE)
- If you have any competing interest to disclose (Please specify).

13. Final Recommendations:

- Excellent: The paper is well written and has significant contribution to the field.
- Very good: The paper needs minor revision, but has significant contribution to the field
- Good: The paper needs some major revisions, but still has contribution to the field
- Fair: The paper needs several major revisions and has many writing errors
- Poor: The contribution this paper would make to the field is not evident or the paper has substantive issues.