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Each article (substantive paper) will be subject to anonymous independent review by two peer reviewers:

i) a specialist in the same field as that of the article and
ii) a member of the Editorial Board or Editorial Advisory Team who will advise on general issues of style, accessibility and appropriacy to the journal ethos

The process will be carried out electronically as far as possible. Initially this will be by email and facilitated by the Assistant Editor but later we may have an online system. At present please see Aims and Scope and Guidelines for Contributors for general reference on style and ethos.

On receipt of the manuscript, please confirm that you are willing and able to complete the review in the stated time period (usually three to four weeks).

Should there be a time problem or a conflict of interest, please contact us to discuss the problem and (if necessary) return the manuscript. If you know (an) other colleague(s) competent to handle the subject matter, please provide their name and email address. The manuscript is not for wider circulation at any stage in the review process.

Comments: please see the pro-forma for comments below.

In your comments for the author do not make statements about the acceptability of a paper. Suggested revisions should be stated as such and not expressed as conditions of acceptance. Organise your typed review so that an introductory paragraph summarises the main findings of the article and gives your overall impression of the paper, highlighting its strengths and any major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments, which, if appropriate, may be subdivided into major and minor points. Criticism should be presented dispassionately.

Confidential comments for the editor: advise the editor of your recommendations for acceptance, modification, or rejection by checking the review section at the appropriate place. The final decision will rest with the editor.

After completing your review: send your comments to the editor. If so requested by the editor, return the original manuscript, otherwise, destroy it. It is recommended that you make a copy of the review for your files. The manuscript may be returned to you for a second review, particularly if the requested medication was extensive. You will need to evaluate the author’s responses to your original criticisms.
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