

Do you want to be considered as a reviewer for *The Journal*? Or – have you been asked to review for *The Journal* but are not sure of the expectations or the process? We've got you covered!

Here are some resources that will get you started. If you have any questions, contact the Editorial Office at journal.pediatrics@cchmc.org.

How to register as a reviewer

Click [here](#) to register on EES. (You must fill out all required information; at the end, tick “Yes” next to the question, “Are you available as a reviewer?”)

Registering in EES adds you to the reviewer database from which reviewers are selected by the Editors; although we cannot guarantee that you will be asked, adding all areas of interest and/or expertise will increase the chances of being asked.

Resources

- ✓ [Elsevier's Reviewer Hub](#)
- ✓ [Elsevier's Certified Peer Reviewer Course](#)
- ✓ [European Association of Science Editors \(EASE\) Peer Reviewer toolkit](#)
- ✓ [Council of Science Editors \(CSE\) Reviewer Roles and Responsibilities](#)
- ✓ [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\): What to consider when asked to peer review a manuscript?](#)

Benefits of reviewing for *The Journal of Pediatrics* include:

- Recognition in a printed list of reviewers provided in each July volume.
- A 30-day free access to Elsevier's premier journal platform, ScienceDirect.
- A 30-day free access to the world's largest abstract and citation database, Scopus.
- Access to a [Reviewer information](#) website, with guidelines and tips.
- A [Reviewer Badge](#) to promote your involvement with *The Journal of Pediatrics*, which can be added to email signature lines.

Get recognition for your peer review activity



Did you know you can add your peer reviewer activity to your ORCID record (<https://orcid.org/>)? If you have a registered ORCID iD, the peer review section of your ORCID record recognizes individual contributions such as reviews of journal articles. Additional information about adding your reviewer activity to your ORCID account can be found [here](#).



Once you have submitted your review, you might want to explore [Elsevier's reviewer recognition platform](#) to ensure that you receive credit for your work. The platform provides a private profile page, certificates, editor recognition as well as discounts for Elsevier services.



If you make use of the [Mendeley](#) profile, your reviewing activities will be automatically captured. Your profile will display your reviewing history and thus demonstrate your input to the peer review process as well as detailing your own articles, positions, and editorial work.

- I. Unpublished manuscripts are the property of the authors. The information contained therein must not be used or shared. If you show this manuscript to anyone while preparing your review, please state who and why in your Confidential Comments for the Editors.
- II. In the Confidential Comments to Editors ONLY, indicate whether the manuscript should be accepted, rejected, or potentially accepted after revisions are made. Be as specific as possible in your Confidential Comments to the Editors, and include the rationale for your recommendation. Please indicate if any part of the paper should be elucidated in an editorial; the Editors would appreciate your suggestions of potential editorial writers (including yourself). This is also a place to inform Editors of potential ethical transgressions.
- III. In the Comments to Authors, write specific constructive criticisms which, if followed, would improve the manuscript. Please number your comments to the authors in order to facilitate their response. DO NOT send an annotated manuscript as your review; only comments included in the online review form can be sent to the Editors and Authors. If you are not in favor of acceptance, be sure to tell the authors your specific objections. Do comment on all of the following (if applicable). Please recommend specific cuts. All manuscripts can be shortened.

Originality/novelty/importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this observation address an important question that has not already been answered from the literature? • Would this be an important addition to the literature?
Publication ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any ethical issues regarding conflict of interest, informed consent, IRB approval, possible duplicate publication, etc.? • As required by <i>The Journal</i>, authors must upload in-press submissions and/or prior publications that have overlapping information with the submitted manuscript. Additional manuscripts and/or published articles are included after the current manuscript in the PDF. Please feel free to include comments regarding overlap in your review.
Clinical trials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this a randomized controlled trial? If so, are the following elements included: (1) clinical trials registry, identification number, and dates of patient enrollment; and (2) the CONSORT flowchart and checklist?
Text presentation	
<i>Abstract</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the Abstract accurately reflect the contents of the manuscript?
<i>Introduction</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it state the problem and study objectives clearly and adequately? Does it review the background adequately, yet succinctly?
<i>Methods</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the methods suitable? Is the design sufficient to answer the question? Does the section contain enough detail? Too much? Is the study group described adequately? Are the equipment and techniques described adequately?
<i>Results</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the data sufficient to answer the question? Is there enough detail? Too much? Do all data presented relate to the main point? Is the statistical analysis adequate?
<i>Discussion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the section too long? Is there material that does not relate to the main point or overlaps with another section? Is previous work in the field reviewed adequately and fairly? Do all conclusions proceed logically from the statistical results? Have the data been interpreted accurately and objectively? Do the conclusions answer the aims of the study? Are the limitations of the study discussed adequately?
<i>Tables and Figures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there enough illustrations? Too many? Is there overlap with text? Are labels clear? Are important features visible and well-marked? Are legends understandable? Is the quality of the figures adequate for publication?
<i>References</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there more than necessary? Do all references relate to the question? Could individual studies be cited instead from review articles? Do they cover the current state of the art fairly? Are any important references omitted? Are there misquotes or misinterpretations of references?