



## *Patient Safety* – Guidelines for Reviewers

Welcome to *Patient Safety*, a peer-reviewed publication that highlights the latest in original research, advanced analytics, and contemporary healthcare issues!

Our mission is to bring clinicians, administrators, and patients the information they need to prevent harm and improve safety by disseminating evidence-based, peer-reviewed research; editorials addressing current and sometimes controversial topics; and analysis of data from one of the largest adverse event reporting databases in the world.

We thank you for your commitment to further advance both the art and science of patient safety. Critical peer review of submitted manuscripts provides an invaluable service to the readers, authors, and editors of *Patient Safety*.

Together we can save lives.

### Patients Included™

*Patient Safety* believes the patient is central to everything we do. *Patient Safety* complies with the guidelines set forth in the Patients Included™ charter for journals, which include having at least two patient members on the editorial board; regularly publishing editorials, reviews, or research articles authored by patients; peer review by patients; and being full open access.

### Timeliness

Reviews generally should be submitted within three weeks of receipt. The review form can be found [here](#). Reviewers should contact the editor with an estimated completion date if they anticipate needing more time. *Patient Safety* welcomes suggestions for alternate reviewers if the reviewer declines a review.

### Conflict of Interest

All reviewers are required to disclose any conflicts of interest that could bias the review process at the time of the review request. When such a potential for bias exists, the reviewer should decline the review request. Additionally, the reviewer shall not use information acquired through the review process for their own personal gain.

### Confidentiality

All manuscripts are confidential. Reviewers should take reasonable care to protect the confidentiality of the manuscript and the subsequent review. Manuscripts should be deleted or destroyed once the

review is complete. Reviews should be deleted or destroyed when the manuscript is published or after six months, whichever occurs first.

## Peer-Review Process

Most manuscripts submitted to *Patient Safety* go through a double-blind, peer-review process, meaning both the author's and the reviewer's identities are unknown to each other. The editor is under no obligation to send a submitted manuscript for review, and they are under no obligation to accept or reject a manuscript based on the recommendations of a reviewer. The peer-review process is designed to provide both the author and the editor unbiased, critical feedback on the suitability of the manuscript for publication. Suitability includes originality, relevance to the field of patient safety, integrity of any research studies, and overall quality of writing.

Original research submissions should include research protocols, statistical analysis methodology, and any contracts associated with the research study. Authors are required to state whether data is available for third parties to view and/or reanalyze. The journal may require the author to provide *Patient Safety* the original data prior to publication for independent data analysis.

Exclusion will not be based on insignificant or inconclusive findings. *Patient Safety* encourages submissions with such findings, as it believes they are equally relevant to advance learning in the field.

## Role and Responsibilities

Providing manuscript review is a rewarding privilege that allows an individual to advance their field. The editorial staff invites reviewers with consideration for their expertise in subject matter; sound ethical character, including the ability to provide unbiased feedback and maintain strict confidentiality; analytical thinking skills with attention to detail; and passion to support and catalyze advancement in the field of patient safety. Therefore, reviewers should keep the following in mind as they read and assess the quality of manuscripts.

- Soundness of approach – Reviews should indicate if the manuscript is a sound approach to the issue/question identified by the author. For example, a manuscript submitted as a case report that contains large sample sizes or discussion of quality improvement activities may not fit the case report type of manuscript. Also consider how well the manuscript is organized, including:
  - Title: How well does the title reflect the manuscript's contents?
  - Abstract: Does the abstract provide a clear, succinct summary?
  - Introduction: Does the introduction provide sufficient context? This section should describe the issue at hand; the experiment and hypothesis, if relevant; and the general methodology.
  - Method: Does the author clearly delineate how the experiment was conducted or how the data was obtained? Do they provide enough information for another researcher to replicate their experiment or analysis?
  - Results: Are the results of the experiment or analysis outlined clearly? Do you have a strong sense of what they found? Do their results seem feasible? If you do not feel comfortable reviewing the statistical components, please contact the editorial staff when you submit your report.
  - Conclusion: Do the conclusions outlined in the manuscript seem reasonable? Do they seem to be well-supported by the information contained within the manuscript? Does this section explain how this research will advance patient safety?
  - Figures: Are the figures relevant? Are they easy to understand?

- Quality of content – Reviews should consider the originality of the work, the relevance to advancement of knowledge in the field, the accuracy of the author findings and references to other works, and the overall readability of the manuscript. Quality of references, gaps in research, and any biases or ethical concerns should also be noted.
- Recommendation of acceptance – All reviews must include a recommendation to accept the manuscript, accept the manuscript with changes, or reject the manuscript. Acceptance with changes should include a detailed narrative regarding areas that require improvement. Rejection should include a detailed narrative outlining key areas of concern.

All reviews should be written in a professional, courteous manner. Deidentified reviews are shared with authors and not only provide constructive feedback on the submitted manuscript, but also serve to mentor authors for future work.

### Recognition

*Patient Safety* recognizes the invaluable contributions its reviewers make to advancing patient safety and preventing harm. To thank them for their time, insights, and expertise, the journal uses the online platform [Kudos](#) to acknowledge their hard work.

Reviewers will be listed on the journal’s website and in the Authority’s annual report. Any individual who completes at least six reviews in one calendar year will be given free registration to the Authority’s annual conference, the Pennsylvania Patient Safety Summit.

If you wish to volunteer to review a manuscript and feel that you possess the qualities the editorial board is seeking please contact the editorial staff at [patientsafetyj@pa.gov](mailto:patientsafetyj@pa.gov).