

International Journal for Transactional Analysis Research

Guidelines for Reviewers

Issued 20 July 2009

Articles are submitted to blind reviews by two independent reviewers. If these two reviews differ widely, a third reviewer will be asked to take the lead in preparing a consolidated response to the author.

Reviewers are expected to make publication recommendations (see below) and may also make suggestions for article amendment. Reviewers should mention positive aspects of an article as well as formulating suggestions for improvement where necessary.

Short summary of the objectives of research

Reviewers should provide a one paragraph description (2-3 sentences) about the research: what field it fits in, what it intends to do.

Overall evaluation of the article

Reviewers should provide, in their evaluation, an answer to the following questions:

- Is this article original and interesting?
- What is the novelty of this research and how does it contribute to the existing literature?
- Does the article fit the objectives and orientation of the journal?
- Does the article fit the journals' quality standards?
- Is the language used clear?
- Does the article have a clear structure?

Literature review

- Is the literature review relevant to the study?
- Does it leave out any significant body of research?
- Is it up to date?
- Are the concepts well defined and presented?
- Is there a good presentation of existing debates in the literature, points of controversy and consensus, as well as a good analysis of what is missing?

Objectives and methodology

- Is there a clear description of hypotheses/objectives?
- Are methodological choices well described and motivated?
- Is there a clear connection between the literature presented, the objectives or research question and the methodology chosen?
- Is there careful consideration of ethical issues included in the article?
- Is the data gathering phase well-described and consistent with objectives/hypotheses?

Presentation and analysis of results

- Are the results well analyzed and supported by the data?
- Is their graphic presentation helpful and easy?
- Do the results provide strong evidence for the conclusions and does the article present a coherent relationship between theory, methodology and results?
- Is the significance of results well analyzed?

Discussion and conclusions:

- Are the results interpreted adequately?
- Is the discussion useful in terms of showing how this research contributes to existing knowledge in the field?
- Are possible implications and applications of the research well-presented?
- Are the limitations of the research made clear?

Final recommendation

Do you recommend that this article be... :

1. Accepted without revision
2. Accepted with minor revisions
3. Accepted with significant revisions
4. Rejected in its current form (with recommendation for submission to a different journal, if appropriate)