

THE JAAOS REVIEW PROCESS

Reviewers are selected by the Deputy Editors and are members of the *Journal's* Editorial Review Board or are chosen from our group of more than 300 consultant reviewers. *JAAOS* standard review articles and Perspectives on Modern Orthopaedics articles are assigned to two or three reviewers; Advances in Therapeutics and Diagnostics and the Surgical Techniques articles are reviewed by the *Journal's* Editorial Board.

JAAOS reviews are double-blinded; the reviewer will not be informed of the identity of the authors. Reviewers must take care not to identify themselves or their institutions within the body of their comments because the editor often directly passes on the reviewer's comments to the author.

We ask that the review be returned in a timely manner, within 3 weeks from the time it is received. Because a decision must wait until all reviews have been returned, a delay by a single reviewer can slow the editorial process.

Reviews are read by the assigned Deputy Editor, who makes the preliminary decision to accept, reject, or revise the manuscript. The Deputy Editor may request that the reviewer comment on an extensively revised manuscript.

THE ROLE OF THE PEER REVIEWER

Your task as a peer reviewer is to judge, critically and constructively, the content of the manuscript. You help determine whether the manuscript is appropriate for the *Journal*. You decide whether the topic is handled substantively and accurately, with appropriate scope and in sufficient detail. The topic should not be too broad or general; we prefer a specific topic that can be well reviewed and discussed in the space of six to eight *Journal* pages (ie, about 4,300 words in length). Your questions to the author, constructive comments, and suggestions are meant both to challenge the author to improve the text where necessary and to guide the author in presenting the material as clearly and concisely as possible. The ultimate goal is an article of practical benefit to the readers of *JAAOS*.

As a reviewer, you must remain unbiased in your critical appraisal of the material in a paper. Your comments to the author should be professional and courteous in tone.

In your narrative review (ie, the written review, in contrast with the ratings given on the evaluation sheet), you should not include an opinion for or against publication.

If you notice that the material under your review is not original or is

duplicative, we ask that you alert the Deputy Editor to this fact as soon as possible.

We ask that you keep in mind that your ethical responsibility as a reviewer is not to make use of material under your review prior to publication.

WRITING THE REVIEW

As a reviewer, please familiarize yourself with the *Journal's* Instructions for Authors, available on the *JAAOS* Website and periodically printed in the monthly *Journal*. Indicate any major divergence from the standard manuscript format. For example, *JAAOS* does not accept primary clinical or basic research studies or case reports.

Structure of the Manuscript

The review analyzes the presented material according to the components of a standard *JAAOS* review article:

Title: The title should succinctly describe the paper and should not be in sentence form.

Abstract: The abstract presents the main points of the paper. Authors are to avoid general statements that "tell" rather than "show"—eg, ask an author to change "This article examines risk factors in this population" to a statement of facts: "Prophylaxis should be used in patients with such risk factors as respiratory failure and hypotension."

Introduction: An introductory paragraph, if pertinent, identifies the matter under discussion, presents background information, relevant statistics and history, and etiology.

Body of the Paper: Here the author reviews the pertinent literature, discusses any controversies or debates, and examines the state of the art. Published studies that are discussed

WHEN YOU RECEIVE AN INVITATION TO REVIEW:

1. Log on to Editorial Manager at: <http://www.editorialmanager.com/jaaos>
2. Go to your "NEW INVITATIONS" folder; click "AGREE TO REVIEW"
3. Go to "PENDING ASSIGNMENTS" Folder; click "SUBMIT RECOMMENDATIONS"
4. Enter your recommendation, blinded comments to the author and confidential comments to the editor; complete the review form
5. Click "SUBMIT"

should be no more than 5 years old, that is, current. When pertinent, treatment methods, such as surgical versus nonsurgical management, are discussed. Figures, tables, and algorithms should be called out appropriately in body of the paper. Also, the authors' discussion of best treatment methods as well as personal experience, when applicable, are included here.

Summary: More than simply a repetition of the text, the Summary reiterates the nature of the problem or the controversy, provides a clear conclusion based on the literature and the authors' experience, and frequently suggests a role for ongoing study and future directions.

References: Generally, the reference section should number 30 to 40

sources. At least a quarter of the references should have been published within the past 5 years. Cited studies should be original research published or in press in the peer-reviewed literature rather than textbooks, abstracts, or poster presentations. (Poster presentations are permitted in Perspectives on Modern Orthopaedics articles.) Personal communications are never allowed.

Writing the Narrative Review

Typically, you will open your review with a paragraph that summarizes the contents of the manuscript. The bulk of your review will be a detailed, numbered list of your concerns. Each numbered item will give the manuscript page number and line

number identifying the location of the problem. The numbering of each item is necessary so that the corresponding author can respond to each concern individually.

You are welcome to note any apparent typographic, grammar, or syntax errors, but you are not obliged to do so. Each manuscript that is ultimately accepted is carefully copy-edited.

If you wish, please also provide a short paragraph mentioning the overall strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. Indicate the usefulness or value of the manuscript to the practicing orthopaedic surgeon and to residents and fellows in training.

Finally, please complete the online evaluation form and include it with your narrative review.