

Reviewer Guidelines for the Journal of Sex Research

Welcome Note

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a peer reviewer for the *Journal of Sex Research (JSR)*. Your role is integral to maintaining the quality and rigor of our journal. This document is designed to guide you through the peer review process, clarify your responsibilities, and provide tools to craft a comprehensive and constructive review.

Becoming a Reviewer

If you are interested in joining the JSR reviewer pool, follow these steps:

- **Set Up an Account:** If you don't already have one, please create an account on our [online submission site](#), ScholarOne.
 - **Identify Your Expertise:** When creating an account in the journal's online system, please be sure to choose some keywords to identify your areas of interest/expertise. To do this, please log into ScholarOne and update your keywords by clicking your name in the upper-right corner and then clicking on "E-mail/Name" and "Next". You will then come to a drop-down box where you can select your keywords.
 - **Seek Mentorship:** New reviewers are encouraged to partner with a mentor for their first few reviews to gain confidence and insight into the process.
 - **Contact the Editor:** Reach out directly to the editor, Cynthia Graham (cygraham@iu.edu), to express your interest in becoming a reviewer. We will then review your application and add a reviewer role to your ScholarOne account if approved.
-

Review Workflow

New submissions are typically reviewed by three reviewers. Approximately 60% of submissions are desk-rejected after an initial editorial assessment.

After completing your review:

- Submit your recommendation (*Accept*, *Minor Revision*, *Major Revision*, or *Reject*) along with comments for the authors and optional confidential comments for the editor. Please do not include your recommendation in your comments to the authors.
- The Editor or Associate Editor will use these inputs to make the final decision.

For revised manuscripts:

- Authors provide a detailed, point-by-point response to reviewer feedback which are available to reviewers.
- Revisions may be re-evaluated by the original reviewers or by the editors, depending on the extent of the revisions required.

Purpose of Peer Review

The peer review process ensures that:

- Articles meet high scientific and ethical standards.
- Research is presented clearly and meaningfully.
- Contributions to the field are valid, innovative, and substantial.

Your feedback shapes not only the quality of published research but also the development of authors within the field.

Reviewer Responsibilities

As a reviewer, you are expected to:

- Evaluate manuscripts within your area of expertise.
 - Complete reviews promptly to maintain the journal's publication timeline.
 - Offer specific, actionable feedback to enhance the manuscript.
 - Maintain strict confidentiality and disclose any conflicts of interest.
 - Provide unbiased and honest assessments.
 - Use a constructive and respectful tone.
-

The Peer Review Process

1. Initial Evaluation

- **Relevance:** Does the manuscript align with JSR's aims and scope?
- **Ethics:** Confirm that ethical considerations, such as IRB approval and participant consent, are addressed.
- **Fit:** Assess whether the manuscript is likely to be of interest to the journal's audience and discipline.
- **Contribution:** Does the manuscript contribute to the literature in this area?

2. Detailed Review

- **Structure:** Carefully assess each section of the manuscript (see checklist below).
- **Content:** Evaluate the scientific rigor, originality, and clarity of the manuscript.
- **Feedback:** Provide actionable, constructive comments to help authors improve their work.

3. Recommendation Based on your review, recommend one of the following:

- **Accept:** Suitable for publication as is.
- **Minor Revision:** Requires small changes that do not impact the core findings but may still require re-review by external reviewers.
- **Major Revision:** Significant changes are needed; reassessment required.

- **Reject:** Manuscript is unsuitable for publication due to fundamental flaws or lack of contribution.
-

How to Provide Constructive Feedback

- **Be Specific:** Reference precise sections of the manuscript (e.g., “In the discussion, page 10, line 25...”) and provide clear examples for improvement.
- **Be Balanced:** Highlight strengths as well as weaknesses. Frame critiques constructively (e.g., “Consider elaborating on...”).
- **Be Respectful:** Use professional language and focus on the work rather than the author.
- **Be Thorough:** Address all relevant aspects of the manuscript.
- **Provide Evidence-Based Feedback:** Support critiques with appropriate references or examples.
- **Be Clear:** Make a concise recommendation regarding the manuscript’s suitability for publication.

Comment Structure:

1. **Summary:** Provide a brief overview of the manuscript, including its main contributions.
 2. **Strengths:** Highlight key strengths and contributions to the field.
 3. **Major Concerns:** Outline substantive issues such as methodological flaws or unsupported claims.
 4. **Minor Concerns:** Note smaller issues such as typos or unclear sentences.
 5. **Recommendation:** Summarize your recommendation for the editor.
-

Basic Reviewer Checklist

- **Research Question:**
 - Does the study address an important, novel, or timely research question?
 - Is the research question clearly stated and justified?
- **Contribution to the Field:**
 - Does the study significantly contribute to the literature?
 - Are the findings relevant to the journal’s scope and readership?
- **Methodology:**
 - Are the methods appropriate, well-explained, and replicable?
 - Are the analyses robust and the results reliable?
- **Presentation:**
 - Is the manuscript well-organized and clearly written?
 - Are tables, figures, and references properly formatted?
- **Ethical Considerations:**
 - Has the study adhered to ethical research guidelines?
 - Is there evidence of ethical approval for the research?

Detailed Reviewer Checklist

- **Title and Abstract:**
 - Does the title accurately reflect the content and scope of the study?
 - Is the abstract clear, concise, and representative of the main aims, methods, results, and conclusions?
 - Does it avoid unnecessary jargon or overstated claims?
- **Introduction:**
 - Does the introduction clearly articulate the research question or problem?
 - Is the literature review comprehensive, balanced, and up-to-date?
 - Does the manuscript's aim align with the research gaps identified?
- **Methods:**
 - Is the study design appropriate for addressing the research question?
 - Are sample size and participant recruitment adequately described?
 - Are methods sufficiently detailed for replication?
 - Have ethical considerations been addressed, such as IRB approval and participant consent?
 - Are the analytical approaches appropriate and robust?
- **Results:**
 - Are results presented clearly, with appropriate use of tables and figures?
 - Do the results align with the stated methods and research questions?
 - Are statistical analyses appropriate and well-documented?
 - Are there any inconsistencies between the data and its interpretation?
- **Discussion:**
 - Does the discussion interpret results logically and in context with existing literature?
 - Are the study's strengths and limitations acknowledged?
 - Are the implications for theory, practice, or future research adequately addressed?
 - Are speculative claims avoided, and conclusions grounded in the findings?
- **References:**
 - Are citations accurate, complete, and relevant?
 - Are seminal works and recent studies included where appropriate?
 - Are review articles avoided in favor of primary sources?

Frequently Asked Questions

- **What if I suspect ethical issues?** Notify the editor immediately and provide evidence for your concerns.
- **What if I'm not an expert on part of the manuscript?** Focus on areas within your expertise and note the limitations of your review.
- **What if I need more time?** Contact the editor as soon as possible to request an extension.

- **Are reviews anonymous?** JSR operates a double-blind peer review process.
 - **Can I suggest additional reviewers?** Yes, if you feel additional expertise would benefit the review process.
 - **What if I have accepted an invite and then realize I may have a conflict of interest?** Notify the editor to explain the situation, as you may need to withdraw if you cannot remain impartial. In general, you shouldn't review a manuscript where past or present work or personal relationships could affect your review.
-

Resources for Reviewers

- **[Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers:](https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/#reviewer_ethical_guidelines)**
https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/#reviewer_ethical_guidelines
 - **[Reviewer Training Materials:](https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/excellence-in-peer-review-reviewer-training-network/)** <https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/excellence-in-peer-review-reviewer-training-network/>
 - **Peer Reviewers [Taylor & Francis AI policy:](https://taylorandfrancis.com/our-policies/ai-policy/)** <https://taylorandfrancis.com/our-policies/ai-policy/>
 - **[Peer review checklist - Editor Resources:](https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/review-checklist/)**
<https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/review-checklist/>
-

Thank You

Thank you for contributing your time and expertise to the *Journal of Sex Research*. Your efforts ensure the publication of high-quality, impactful research in the field of human sexuality.