

**PEER REVIEWER GUIDELINES**

**New Zealand College of Midwives Journal  
 Te Hautaka o Te Kāreti o ngā Kaiwhakawhānau ki Aotearoa**

**Contents**

**Introduction..... 1**  
 Appointing reviewers to a manuscript..... 2  
**Writing the review ..... 3**  
 Overview of your role as a reviewer ..... 3  
 AI technology..... 3  
 Providing your feedback..... 3  
**What happens next? ..... 4**  
 From review to publication..... 4

**Introduction**

Peer review is integral to the academic publishing process of the New Zealand College of Midwives Journal | Te Hautaka o Te Kāreti o ngā Kaiwhakawhānau ki Aotearoa (the Journal). The Journal Editorial Board is committed to supporting our team of peer reviewers to provide us with quality reviews, which support authors to produce articles that are of a high academic standard. We cannot maintain the Journal’s quality and integrity without the work of our reviewers, so thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer and for the time and effort you put into your role.

These Reviewer Guidelines for are designed to be read in conjunction with our [Contributor Guidelines](#), so please familiarise yourself with them before you begin your review.

*(Document updated March 2026)*

If you are interested in furthering your knowledge or skills around peer reviewing (including its history, purpose, approach and output), you may like to consider the Elsevier Researcher Academy's Certified Peer Review eLearning course, which is offered without charge and requires a free registration to access: <https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/navigating-peer-review/certified-peer-reviewer-course>

## Appointing reviewers to a manuscript

If the manuscript is accepted by the Co-Editors for review, we approach two (or sometimes three) peer reviewers who are suited to the manuscript, having considered their organisational affiliations and their topic and methodological expertise. We keep a database of reviewers' details, so please let us know if yours changes.

We also consider when reviewers last reviewed a manuscript for the Journal, as we try to limit the number of reviews to no more than one a year (depending on the submissions received).

The invitation to review a manuscript includes:

- The abstract, which must be kept confidential and not shared with others. Furthermore, it must not be used by reviewers in their own research until such time as the article has been published.
- The expected timeframe, usually a three-week turnaround from when we send the manuscript.

We appreciate reviewers' prompt response to an invitation, so if they are unavailable, we can approach another reviewer in a timely manner.

When reviewers are invited to review a manuscript, we ask that they consider the following:

- Does my area of expertise match the topic?
- Do I have any interests that might prevent an objective review, (e.g. do I know who the author is)?
- Do I have time to do this, given that an estimated time of five hours is required to adequately write a review?
- Can I complete the review in the prescribed turnaround time?

When a reviewer accepts an invitation, the editorial administrator sends the anonymised manuscript, along with supporting documents. The date we would like to receive your review is also confirmed.

## Writing the review

As you review the manuscript, please refer to our [Contributor Guidelines](#) to help you identify whether authors have adhered to the Journal's ethical criteria, research guidance and reporting guidelines.

It is also important to note the following confidentiality and ethical considerations:

- The manuscript and your review must be kept confidential and not shared with others. Content must not be used in reviewers' own research until the manuscript has been published.
- The Journal uses a double-anonymised peer review process, so the identity of authors is not shared with reviewers. Similarly, the identity of the reviewers is not provided to the authors or the manuscript's other reviewer/s, so please ensure that no potentially identifying details are included in your review.
- If you suspect plagiarism or that the author has unlawfully copied all or part of another author's word (or their own), this needs to be brought to the Co-Editors' attention. This is a serious issue.
- Similarly, if the content appears fraudulent or you have doubts about an ethical aspect of the manuscript, please share your concerns with the Co-Editors.

## Overview of your role as a reviewer

Your role is to carefully and objectively critique the manuscript in a formalised manner. Reviewers are expected to identify the strengths and weaknesses and suggest improvements they consider necessary to support the quality of the manuscript.

It is not necessary for you to focus on elements such as spelling, grammar or punctuation, as detailed proofreading with editorial oversight is undertaken as part of the in-house processes, once the manuscript is accepted in principle for publication.

## AI technology

We invite you to review a manuscript because of your experience and expertise. Therefore, to maintain integrity of the review process and to avoid breaching confidentiality of the manuscript, please do not upload any part of the manuscript or your review into a generative AI tool. Any information uploaded to an AI tool in effect becomes part of the tool's "intelligence" and can be regenerated for other users in the public domain.

## Providing your feedback

You are welcome to use the Reviewer Feedback Table that we provide. However, if you are an experienced reviewer, you may prefer to present your report in an alternative format.

Whichever format you use, please also complete the Reviewer Declaration & Recommendation form and return it with your feedback.

We encourage you to structure your review methodically to assist authors as they address your feedback:

- Please note line numbers for specific points.
- Authors find reviewers' written comments to be the most helpful.

## What happens next?

### From review to publication

Once reviews have been received, we send you an anonymised copy of the other review/s. The aim is to support reviewers by providing an insight into a different perspective.

The appointed Associate Editor oversees reviewer feedback and recommendations and notes their own editorial comments. These comments and a copy of each review are sent to the author.

The Associate Editor works with the author to improve the overall academic standard of the manuscript through a process of critique, feedback and revision. Our goal is to encourage authors with this editorial process.

When the Associate Editor is satisfied with all revisions, they recommend to the Co-Editor whether the article is suitable for publication. If a reviewer has recommended that the manuscript be accepted with major revisions, they are invited to re-review the revised manuscript.

The Co-Editor assesses the manuscript and makes the final decision regarding acceptance for publication.

We inform the reviewers of the outcome and the manuscript goes through a process of proofreading and in-house checks before publication. Authors are kept informed as their manuscript progresses through this process.

The Journal uses online, open-access, article-based publishing, so once an article is finalised for publication, it is first disseminated to College members and then published on the [College website](#). A copy will also be emailed to any reviewer of the article who isn't a College member.

Articles are searchable on the [Aotearoa New Zealand Midwifery Research Database](#) and by DOI. They are also indexed in the Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Scopus and ProQuest.