

JIRIRI

Procedures for reviewing and/or editing an article

Role of the members of the editorial board in the reviewing process:

1. Role of the editor-in-chief
 2. Role of the associate editors
 3. Role of the reviewer
 4. Role of the editor
- **Note to all members of the editorial board:** Please indicate the manuscript number in subject field of the email (e.g. Article 2000-00) as well as its complete title in the body of the text when communicating with the editor-in-chief and/or the associate editors.

JIRIRI

Role of the editor-in-chief

The editor-in-chief is responsible for:

- 1. *Verifying the manuscripts when received***
 - Verifying the author's eligibility
 - Verifying if the manuscript generally respects APA norms
 - Insuring the author's confidentiality
- 2. *Assigning a person who will be responsible for the article***
 - Either the editor-in-chief or one of the associate editors will be responsible for the follow-up of the article.

For some articles, the editor-in-chief is responsible for:

- 3. *Distributing manuscripts to members of the editorial board***
 - When possible, the editor-in-chief tries to distribute the manuscripts to the reviewers according to their interests and availabilities.
- 4. *Ensuring a follow-up of the revision process and verifying the reviews when received***
- 5. *Distributing the evaluations to an assigned editor***
 - He/She communicates with the editor in order to ensure that the author receives the most accurate evaluation as possible. The editor-in-chief verifies the editor's letter (its content, integration of reviews, etc.).
- 6. *Communicating the editorial board's decision to the author***

JIRIRI

Role of the associate editors

The associate editors are responsible for:

- 1. *Distributing manuscripts to members of the editorial board***
 - When possible, the associate editors try to distribute the manuscripts to the reviewers according to their interests and availabilities.
- 2. *Ensuring a follow-up of the revision process and verifying the evaluations when received***
 - They communicate with the editor in order to ensure that the evaluation is as accurate as possible. The associate editors verify the editor's letter (its content, integration of reviews, etc.).
- 3. *Distributing the evaluations to an assigned editor***
- 4. *Communicating the editorial board's decision to the author***

JIRIRI

Role of the reviewer

The reviewer's letter to the editor must include:

1. *The decision concerning the publication of the article*

- The article is accepted as it is (rare)
- The article is accepted with minor revisions
- The article is rejected with the possibility to resubmit a modified version
- The article is rejected

2. *The main modifications needed*

- The comments are inspired by the criteria proposed in the evaluation grid.
- The comments must identify the main flaws and aspects that need improvement.
- The reviewer must make clear which sections of the manuscript are criticized
- It is important for the reviewer to explain why certain aspects of the article are being criticized and to suggest how the author might improve his/her manuscript. The suggestions made by the reviewer must be specific enough so the author may easily make modifications.

3. **The reviewer must NOT sign his/her name on any of the reviewed documents**

JIRIRI

Role of the reviewer

IMPORTANT:

- **REVIEWERS ARE NO LONGER REQUIRED TO SUBMIT A COPY OF THE ARTICLE WITH “TRACK CHANGES”.**
 - The letter to the editor must contain all the pertinent information regarding the manuscript.
- If a (or many) passage(s) is(are) problematic the reviewer can always direct the author’s attention to it by referring to the lines numbers. This would make it easier for the author to find the section the reviewer criticized.
- If there are many grammatical mistakes in the article, the author can always mention it in a general manner (e.g. “There are many grammatical errors in your article, I suggest you reread carefully your work and make the appropriate modifications.”). **The reviewer should not correct himself/herself the mistakes in the article.**

JIRIRI

Example of a reviewer's letter

Review manuscript 2000-00

The article is rejected with the possibility to resubmit.

Potential and theoretical Strength:

- I find that the general goal of this manuscript is an important one: It attempts to integrate past research into a model that explains how an individual might react to the images of very thin women perpetuated by the media. Although an important goal, I have trouble seeing how this goal falls into the field of the social psychology of identity, interpersonal relations, or intergroup relations. The link to one of these subfields needs to be made much stronger.
- The model proposed is of great applied importance. Theoretically however, I am having trouble understanding its addition to existing theoretical knowledge, as I find the concepts included in the model to not be clearly defined. My main concern is with the inclusion of the concept of “coping mechanisms” and/or “fragilisation” within the model. I feel that this concept is never fully explained. As it is, the model cannot help us predict an understandable outcome as it relies entirely on vaguely identified “coping mechanisms” instead of on a theoretically supported predictor. How are we to know if someone has good “coping mechanisms” or not? Without this knowledge, the proposed model would not give us much information. It might help to include a diagram of the proposed model to help the reader understand it. Even if this is done however, the author still needs to more clearly explain the components of the model.

Justification

- The first paragraph of the paper is not well-supported. All ideas need to be referenced. For example “Diet is now an industry itself, and restrained eating has become the norm rather than the exception” needs to be supported with a reference, as does the sentence that follows. Throughout, the author could use more references to back up his or her ideas. Again, the

JIRIRI

Example of a reviewer's letter

inclusion of “coping mechanisms” in the model is not justified by any literature or theories reviewed prior to the proposal of the model.

Structure and integration:

- I found that the order of the paper is logical and that it flows well. However, in places, I found it to be unclear. I had trouble understanding the review of the Polivy et al. study and its concept of assimilation. I was not sure I grasped when and why assimilation might occur. This translated into confusion over the concept of assimilation in the proposed model, in that it was unclear when and why one would assimilate an image to the self.
- The concept of assimilation needs to be reviewed and explained more clearly in order for the model to be understood. The final page of the paper needs to include a more coherent link to the theories reviewed in the paper and to discuss the implications of the proposed model and why they are important theoretically, and for the everyday world. It needs to deal with what the author actually discussed in the paper, rather than with new ideas about society.
- The author has made a good attempt at integrating the reviewed theories into his or her proposed model, and has linked the review to the overall goal of the proposal. The inclusion of “coping mechanisms” however seems to come out of nowhere. It was not based on theory or research reviewed in the literature review section of the paper. Since it appears to be the main mechanism of the model, it needs to be explained previous to the model proposal.

Style:

- The manuscript does not follow apa style. Formatting changes need to be made to the title page, the page numbers, paragraph indents, spacing between sentences, and references to be consistent with apa style.

JIRIRI

Role of the editor

The editor's letter must include:

1. *The identification information of the manuscript*

- The manuscript's number
- The manuscript's title

2. *A summary of the reviewers' comments*

- The editor must indicate which comments deserve the most attention and which are less relevant. He/she must also mention which were the most frequent criticisms made by the reviewers.
- The editor must identify which are the most relevant modifications that need to be done.

3. *The decision concerning the publication of the article (see the following slide)*

- The article is accepted as it is (rare)
- The article is accepted with minor revisions
- The article is rejected with the possibility to resubmit a modified version
- The article is rejected

JIRIRI

The editor's decision

- ***The article is accepted as it is (rare)***
- ***The article is accepted with minor revisions***
 - Minor corrections are needed.
 - If the author does not agree with the corrections proposed by the editor, he is invited to explain why the corrections should not be made.
- ***The article is rejected with the possibility to resubmit a modified version***
 - The subject is interesting and the text has potential.
 - Important corrections must be brought.
 - Please note that this does not imply any engagement to publish the manuscript once the article is modified and resubmitted.
- ***The article is rejected***
 - Submit the article to another journal.