

## **FOCUS ON HEALTH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION: A MULTIPROFESSIONAL JOURNAL**

### **REVIEWER GUIDELINES**

*Focus on Health Professional Education: A Multi-Professional Journal* publishes original papers and other contributions on all aspects of health professional education, spanning undergraduate, postgraduate and continuing education. We publish a wide range of contributions, including original research (full length or short reports), systematic reviews, discussion/conceptual papers, reports on educational innovations and letters to the Editor. Papers submitted may focus on any aspect of health professional education, e.g. curriculum design and development, aspects of learning, teaching approaches, assessment, and evaluation.

Thank you for participating in the review process for *Focus on Health Professional Education (FoHPE)*. Your role in the review process is twofold:

- (1) To use your expertise as a health professional educator to advise the Associate Editor on whether a paper is of sufficient quality to accept for publication (with or without revisions) or whether the paper should be rejected.
- (2) To inform the authors of the strengths and weaknesses of their papers, and to advise on how improvements might be made. The role of reviewers in providing constructive feedback is of considerable importance in developing scholarship in health professional education.

All papers and reviews must be treated as confidential.

#### **THE REVIEW PROCESS**

In order to achieve these two goals you will have to read the manuscript carefully – experienced reviewers often suggest a minimum approach of a first read-through without making notes to gain an overview of the paper and then a second read whilst making feedback notes. Please read each manuscript with objectivity and attention to detail.

You may have been chosen to be a reviewer either because the topic is within your area of expertise, or because you represent a typical general reader. Both perspectives are important in assessing a paper for publication.

#### **Confidentiality**

Please note that the manuscript constitutes a privileged communication and is the exclusive property of the author(s). **If you wish to discuss the paper with a colleague or if you feel that a colleague would be a more appropriate reviewer, contact the corresponding Associate Editor first.**

#### **Conflict of interest**

If you find that the paper concerns work with which you were involved, or if you are personally involved with any of the authors in any way which might compromise your objectivity, please reply to the invitation email with this information as soon as possible. In such a case, we would appreciate any suggestions you can make for a suitable reviewer who has no connection with the study or the authors. You can view the 'Conflict of Interest' policy in the Policy section of About the Journal.

#### **Timeliness**

One of the goals of the Editorial Board is to complete the review process within three months from submission of the paper. **We therefore ask you to complete your review within two weeks of the date of the invitation to review.** If you have any questions regarding these guidelines, or your role as a reviewer, please reply to the Associate Editor or contact us at the ANZAHPE Office: [anzahpeoffice@flinders.edu.au](mailto:anzahpeoffice@flinders.edu.au)

If you are unable to review the paper within this time frame, but are willing to review it, please could you negotiate with the Associate Editor.

### **Papers published in FoHPE**

Papers may focus on any aspect of health professional education, e.g. curriculum design and development, aspects of learning, teaching approaches, assessment, and evaluation. Submissions should be grounded in the relevant literature or theoretical framework.

FoHPE publishes papers in a range of formats, each of which has different requirements, as outlined in the [author guidelines](#):

- original research (full length or short reports) and systematic reviews
- discussion or conceptual papers
- brief innovation reports
- letters to the Editor

Details of these formats are outlined below.

### ***Original Research and Reviews***

Quantitative or mixed method original research papers should be less than 3500 words in length (excluding abstract, references and tables or figures). Qualitative original research or review papers with substantial qualitative components (e.g. qualitative metasyntheses) can be up to 5000 words. Appendices are negotiable if they are integral to the understanding of the paper and are not freely available online.

Reports of completed research, both quantitative and qualitative, are welcome, and should be presented in a structured format; with an introduction (including research aims and questions or hypotheses), methods and analysis, results, discussion and conclusions, strengths and limitations and directions for future research (laMaRDc format).

Review papers may include systematic or scoping reviews, or other types of reviews that are methodically conducted and follow a defined process that is grounded in relevant literature. These papers should include a PRISMA flow diagram that summarises the screening process.

Both research and review papers should be accompanied by a structured abstract of no more than 250 words, included within the original main document submitted, and placed following the title but before the body of the paper.

### ***Short Reports***

These papers are intended to provide a brief overview of a research project that addresses a relevant topic for the readership but is a small, preliminary or pilot project. For example, it may involve small samples, a single site, or a preliminary evaluation (which should still use methodological rigour). Papers should be 1000– 2000 words in length. Up to ten references and one table or figure can be included.

Short reports should be structured in a way that assists the reader: e.g. the laMaRDc format, or a customised format to be determined by the author, where the rationale is explained in the accompanying cover letter. A 150 word abstract should be included with the original main document submitted.

### ***Conceptual and Discussion Papers***

These papers are discussions of theoretical and conceptual issues or trends in health professional education that are designed to stimulate debate and reflection on practices within the field. They should follow a defined structure, determined by the author/s, and explained in the accompanying cover letter. Arguments should be substantiated with relevant literature. A 150 word abstract should be included with the original main document submitted. Papers should be no more than 3000 words.

### ***Innovative Teaching and Learning Projects (ITLP)***

This category provides an opportunity for authors to share their innovations in a brief report without producing a full research paper. The ITLP accommodates small-scale innovations in health professional education and is particularly designed for emerging “hot topics”. Each ITLP submission should be limited to 800 words of main text, three references and one figure or table. No Abstract is required.

Submissions must be structured under the following headings:

- Introduction - What is the background or context for your innovation?
- Innovation - What did you do?
- Evaluation - How did you measure the impact of the innovation?
- Lessons learned – What are the implications of the findings? How can these be used in practice?
- What next? - What further research is needed? How might this innovation be relevant in other settings?

ITLP submissions will be assessed for innovation, evaluation methodology, wider application, and their potential as a stimulus for development and new ideas.

### ***Letters to the Editor***

Letters that reflect on, and encourage debate about, current topical issues relevant to health professional education will be considered. Letters must be less than 500 words, have no more than three references, and no tables or figures.

### ***Practical Information about Submitting Your Review***

On accepting the invitation to review, you will have access to the review page on the FoHPE website. There you will be able to open the manuscript file and complete your review online. The online review form has a mix of check boxes, drop-down lists and free text.

**Please complete your review on the online review page and do not upload an edited or annotated version of the original manuscript document.**

### **The Review Process**

Initially, please consider the following basic requirements:

- The [guideline for authors](#) has been followed
- The manuscript falls within the scope of the journal (theory, research or practice relevant to health professional educators)
- The quality of the writing is of a suitable standard (or could be made so)
- The research makes a contribution to what is already known

PLEASE COMPLETE THE ONLINE REVIEW FORM.

CHECK BOXES: These cover the broad aspects of the submission. Please respond to each of these questions.

STUDY METHODOLOGY: As papers on health professional education may include both quantitative, qualitative and mixed method studies, you will be asked to make further decisions based on the methodology used in the particular study being reported. These relate to the methods and interpretation.

REPORT FOR AUTHOR: You will be expected to enter some detailed feedback and most reviewers find it easier to write this offline in a document and then to cut and paste this into the relevant text box online. Many reviewers find it useful to make comments under the same headings used in the paper (e.g. introduction or methods). You may also find it helpful to consider the questions posed below:

- Are you clear about the purpose of this paper? If not, indicate this to the author and explain why, as far as is possible.
- Is the paper anchored in the relevant literature (professional, discipline-based, educational) and are the references up to date?
- Where appropriate, has a research question or problem area been identified? Does the paper address that issue directly? How?
- Where appropriate, are the methods and analyses appropriate for the research question posed?
- Where appropriate, are the results or outcomes clearly expressed?
- Where appropriate, are the conclusions clear and valid? Are they supported by the results? Are there implications for future practice or research?
- Where appropriate, were the limitations of the study discussed?
- Where appropriate, have any ethical issues (including consent) been addressed?

Please aim to be constructive and specific.

You should make an overall comment on presentation and style. You may recommend detailed specific typographic or grammatical changes where they are crucial to the meaning of the text. However, these will generally be dealt with at the copy-editing stage.

**Please number or use bullets for each comment and where possible refer to the page and line number.** This will enable the authors to respond systematically, and assist your task if their corrections are forwarded back to you for further comment. If the manuscript requires extensive work on syntax or punctuation, you should report this in your review. You should indicate clearly all revisions or changes you recommend for the paper if you have recommended Revisions Required.

Your comments will be sent to the author(s) exactly as submitted by you and should therefore provide tactful, critical and constructive feedback. This is an important part of the commitment by the Editorial Board of the journal to providing advice and feedback to authors regardless of whether the paper is accepted or rejected. Bear in mind that ANZAHPE is a professionally and culturally diverse group. The Editorial Board is committed to providing advice and encouragement to novice researchers and writers whose first language is not English.

**Please do not mention in the report to authors whether you think the paper should be accepted or rejected.**

**Please do not add your name or any identifying information as we operate a double-blind review process.**

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR: Private comments to the editorial office may be entered into the separate marked text box. This information is not shared with the author(s). This report is intended to assist the Associate Editor and the Editor in decision-making. Completion of this section is optional.

This guide and a 'Beginners guide to reviewing a manuscript' are available on the [Review for FoHPE](#) page of the ANZAHPE website.

**We are very grateful to all of our reviewers for their time and expertise.**

*FoHPE acknowledges the contribution of reviewers in the last issue of each volume of the journal and on the ANZAHPE website ([view here](#)). We acknowledge reviewers who have been active in the preceding twelve months.*

Focus on Health Professional Education (FoHPE) is the official journal of the Australian & New Zealand Association for Health Professional Educators (ANZAHPE).