

Peer-Review Guidelines *Journal of Hematology Oncology Pharmacy (JHOP)*

Target audience: Hematology Oncology Pharmacists

In general, use specific comments: general comments, such as “a great article,” are not helpful unless explained. All articles are edited for grammar and style, so focus on substance. Be clear: don’t leave any room for guessing or misinterpretation. A good review ranges from 1 to 2 pages. Do NOT use artificial intelligence to aid your review.

1. Your main goal is to ensure that all statements of fact are correct and supported by reference citations. For example, if the authors say, “X and Y drugs are contraindicated,” make sure they are indeed contraindicated. If not, tell the authors they are not. Drug-related information must be up to date, not from 2-3 years ago.

2. Be specific. Statements such as “not a significant contribution,” or “clinically unimportant” are not useful unless you explain the reasons why this is so.

3. Suggest specific ways to correct things if the article has merit but requires modifications.

4. Key questions to consider: A Practical Issues in Pharmacy Management article can be an Original Research article or a Review Article. Please refer to the appropriate category below.

- **Original Research**

- Is the manuscript appropriate for *JHOP*?
- Is the method clearly explained?
- Is the data analysis valid and clear? Is the statistical analysis accurate?
- Is anything missing in the Limitations section?
- Are the Tables and/or Figures appropriate and clear? Do they support the text?
- Is the Conclusion supported by the data presented in this study?
- Are any important areas omitted that should be added?

- **Review Article**

- Is the topic appropriate for *JHOP*?
- Is the Discussion comprehensive? Does it cover all relevant areas of the topic?
- Are the Tables and/or Figures clear and support the discussion?
- Should other elements be added?
- Is the Conclusion valid based on the Discussion?
- Are any important areas omitted that should be added?

5. References. Are references up-to-date, with citations supporting all statements of fact? Authors should provide the most recent references available post-2012 (except for “classic” sources). Are any key references missing? Are the references in consecutive order?

6. Prioritize your comments. It helps to know what major issues should be addressed, and what comments are less critical to the acceptance of the article.

7. Be respectful of the authors, but don’t “spare” them. Scholarship is not easy and criticism is not pleasant to receive. So be critical, but respectful. Don’t be afraid to provide negative

comments, but concrete suggestions on how to fix things are most useful. Make your comments the way you would want to receive criticism.

Thank you!