



Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing Peer Review Guidelines & Manuscript Review Form

About Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing

Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing (CPHCM) is an online journal featuring peer-reviewed case studies in public health communication and social marketing. Two peer-reviewed journal issues are published annually: an annual Volume of investigator initiated submissions, and a supplementary compendium of invited papers, called *Proceedings*.

Manuscripts submitted to *CPHCM* should examine a public health communication or marketing program, or a broader public health initiative in which communication or social marketing methods played an important role. In particular, a case study will include both a description and an original analysis or evaluation of a health communication or social marketing program, or program component. The intent is to reach, inform, engage, influence, motivate, support, or sustain changes that will ultimately improve health outcomes or benefit society.

Manuscript Selection Criteria

Publication decisions will be made based on the following criteria:

- Level of contribution to public health communication or social marketing theory, practice, and research.
- Timeliness and relevance of the case study to *CPHCM* readers and public health community.
- Innovativeness of the public health communication or social marketing approach.
- The extent to which the program is grounded in the theoretical, empirical, or practice evidence.
- Strength of the evaluation or assessment design, methods, and analytic procedures.
- The inclusion of an insightful, accurate, and critical summary of the case study findings, lessons learned and implications for practice and/or research.
- The extent to which the findings are generalizable and/or helpful to public health practice or research settings.

Selection of Peer Reviewers

Selected case studies will be peer-reviewed. Authors are welcome to suggest potential reviewers. Independent expert reviewers will be identified by the GW *CPHCM* editorial team. *CPHCM* seeks a balance in the selection of peer reviewers. Reviewers are selected on the basis of several factors, including expertise, prior publications in the same topic area or field, and/or experiences with specific health communication and social marketing approaches or evaluation methods. *CPHCM* editors typically recruit at least one content expert, practitioner and researcher to serve as a peer reviewer for each case study. All manuscripts accepted for peer review will have at least two external reviewers. Prior performance as a peer reviewer (including quality and timeliness) is important to the journal reviewer selection. Reviewers may be asked to re-review manuscripts that are revised and resubmitted for publication consideration.

Confidentiality Notice & Potential Conflicts of Interest

The review process will be blinded. The peer reviewers will be unaware of the identities of the authors and vice versa. As a condition of agreeing to review a manuscript, all reviewers undertake to keep submitted manuscripts and associated data confidential. If a reviewer perceives that there may be a conflict of interest (financial or otherwise) for a manuscript that they are invited to review, they should either seek clarification with the assigning editor or decline the invitation.

Questions to Consider When Conducting a Review

Reviewers are asked to consider and comment on the following when conducting a review:

- Does the case contribute to the field of public health communication and marketing?
- Was the case topic or approach innovative?
- Does the case provide insight that may be helpful to other research or practice professionals?
- Does the case provide an insightful, critical analysis of the program implemented?
- Was the analysis or evaluation well-designed and executed?
- Does the analysis or evaluation support the author's claims and conclusions?
- Are the supporting pieces (charts, graphs) helpful, frivolous, or lacking?
- Was the case interesting to read?
- Was the case well written?
- How could the case study be improved?

Manuscript Review Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

The primary purpose of peer review is to provide the journal editors with the information they need to reach a manuscript decision, and the authors with constructive feedback on how to improve their manuscript for publication either in *CPHCM* or elsewhere.

The *Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing* journal does not have an online manuscript submission and review system. Therefore, reviewers are asked to use the **Manuscript Review Form** to complete their reviews. The Manuscript Review Form consists of three sections: 1) Confidential Comments for the Editors, 2) Comments for the Authors, and 3) a Summary Rating Form. While we ask reviewers to be as clear and succinct as possible, there are no page limits to the comments sections. Reviewers are welcome to use a separate Word file to write comments, so long as the comments to the editors and those specifically for the authors are clearly distinguishable.

Confidential Comments for the Editors: Reviewers are asked to provide confidential comments to the editors about the importance and contribution of the manuscript, its overall quality, strengths and weaknesses, and more specific comments that describe the arguments for and against publication including the various sections or areas where changes are recommended prior to publication. When a manuscript is unacceptable in its present form, reviewers are asked to provide the editors with an opinion about whether the case study is sufficiently promising enough to warrant resubmission. These reviewer comments will not be shared with the authors, but will aid the editors in making a final decision.

Comments for the Authors: Reviewers are asked to provide instructive comments to the authors so that they can readily understand the basis for the final editorial decision and determine how best to improve their manuscript for publication. Comments to the authors should be constructive and sufficiently detailed. Reviewers should provide a general overview of the manuscript strengths and weaknesses, impressions of the various sections (e.g., abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusions, tables/figures), and detailed comments (i.e., citing page numbers and lines) as to where the text is unclear or changes may

be needed. Offensive comments about the weaknesses of a manuscript and opinions as to whether a paper should be published are to be avoided in the reviewer comments to authors.

Summary Rating Form: Reviewers are asked to complete the Summary Rating Form after completing their review. Overall ratings are requested in several different areas along with a recommendation to the editors for manuscript publication. This rating form is for editorial review and decision-making purposes only, and will not be shared with the authors.

Review Submission: Once reviewers have completed a review, all three sections of the completed Manuscript Review Form should be attached to an e-mail that is sent to the following confidential e-mail address: gwcases@gmail.com.

Editorial Team Decisions

Once reviewers have completed their review, an editorial team decision will be made giving consideration to all reviewer comments. Because *CPHCM* publishes case studies that span both research and practice, and reviewers are selected to reflect each perspective, there may be differences between reviewers regarding the suitability of a manuscript for publication. The editorial team will attempt to balance these varying perspectives, and may contact reviewers for clarification of comments or discrepancies prior to making a final decision.

Assessments by peer reviewers in combination with editorial judgment are used to determine if a manuscript is accepted for publication, or whether a request for resubmission is made. The decision to publish a manuscript will *not* be based upon the direction of the findings; both significant/favorable findings and those that are non-significant/unfavorable will be considered for publication.

Editorial team decisions will then be communicated directly to authors. Each peer reviewer will receive a blind copy of the journal correspondence to authors along with blind copies of all other peer reviewer comments thereafter.

Request for Re-Review of Revised Manuscript

Authors asked to revise and resubmit their manuscript have three weeks to do so. Upon receipt, the revised manuscript is sent out for a second peer review. We typically ask the original reviewers to "re-review" the revised manuscript, taking note of whether or not the author has adequately addressed the reviewers' comments. Reviewers will receive an electronic copy of the revised manuscript, a copy of the author "Response to Reviewer Comments," and a second ***Manuscript Review Form*** to complete their re-review.

Timeliness

Because we are committed to providing timely editorial decisions, potential reviewers are requested to respond promptly and those who accept invitations to review are requested to provide their comments within the agreed timeframe. If reviewers anticipate that they will not be able to meet the journal review deadlines, they are requested to inform the assigning editor so that alternative arrangements can be made. Suggesting alternative reviewers is greatly appreciated. ***Reviewers will have three weeks to complete each review.***