MANUSCRIPT REVIEW PROCESS

Category: Uncategorized

The manuscript review process for *Perspectives in Health Information Management* is a double-blind review method; the identity of the author(s) is concealed from the reviewers and the editors.

New manuscripts receive an initial review by the editors to determine if they are suitable for the journal before they are reviewed by the Editorial Review Panel. If accepted for ERP review, a manuscript typically goes through two review cycles. If accepted with minor or major revisions after the first review, the article with reviewer comments is sent to the author. The author then responds to the reviewer comments in the resubmission process The revised article is then sent back to two of the three reviewers for a second review. This process is repeated until the article is accepted with no revisions or is rejected.

After manuscripts are accepted, authors will be asked to sign a copyright transfer agreement which must be returned prior to manuscript publication. Authors will receive a proof before publication for final approval.

Reviewers evaluate manuscripts using the criteria listed below:

Writing

- Length follows guidelines for authors for each type of column or paper manuscript
- Writing is clear and unambiguous and language appropriate to the type of manuscript
- Manuscript is well organized and flows well

Interest

- Content is innovative or unique
- Content is valuable, important, and beneficial to readers
- Topic or focus is of interest to our readers

Research Criteria

- The problem or question is clearly stated
- Underlying concept as represented by theory, model, or framework is sound
- Illustrations, examples, or references are relevant and sufficient
- Specific sources are given when needed
- The concept is applicable to other situations
- The design of the research or investigation is sound
- The method supports the investigation's purpose
- A reader could replicate the operations described
- Analytical techniques are sound
- Data are clearly represented

- Tables and figures are clear and accurate
- Data and information appear accurate
- Data support conclusions drawn
- Content is innovative or unique
- Essential points are adequately covered
- Length is appropriate
- Content builds or advances body of knowledge of health information management or its practice
- References are current and appropriate

There are no comments yet.