



Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Review Guidelines

NOTE. AS OF AUGUST 2016, REVIEWS WILL BE COMPLETED USING ScholarOne™ Manuscripts ONLINE SYSTEM. DETAILS ARE PROVIDED IN THESE GUIDELINES.

Contents

Subject Matter and Scope.....	2
Peer Review Process	2
Blinding.....	2
Appointment of Reviewers.....	2
Reviewer’s Responsibilities	2
Evaluating the Manuscript	3
Process using ScholarOne™ Manuscripts	3
Confidential Recommendation	5
Queries	5
Contact Us.....	6



Subject Matter and Scope

The *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CJCCJ)* publishes quarterly coverage of the theoretical and empirical aspects of the study of crime and the practical problems of law enforcement, administration of justice and the treatment of offenders, particularly in the Canadian context. The *Journal* accepts submissions based on qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methods research as well as theoretical submissions and evidence-based commentaries.

Peer Review Process

The *CJCCJ* is a peer-reviewed forum for original contributions and discussion in the field of criminology and criminal justice. The major criterion for peer review is that the submission is based on high-quality research, theoretical analysis or evidence-based commentary. However, given the clear mandate of the *Journal*, preference should be given to articles with Canadian content and to those related in some way to a Canadian project, institution, practice, etc. The quality of writing reflected in all submissions should meet the highest standards of scholarly expression.

Blinding

The *CJCCJ* uses a double-blind peer review process, meaning that neither the reviewers nor the authors know each other's identity. In addition, the reviewers are not aware of each other's identity. Each manuscript is evaluated by at least two reviewers. Your anonymized review will be sent to the authors (note: there is space on the review form for you to enter confidential information for the Editor only). In most cases, you will also be sent the anonymized evaluations of the other reviewers.

Please remove any information that would identify you from the "properties" section of your Word file. To do this go to the document and click on "file," scroll down to "properties" and delete any identifying information. If you are sending a PDF please remove your information before you create the PDF version of the review.

Appointment of Reviewers

Manuscript reviewers are appointed by the Editor. They are selected because they have expertise related to the content or methodology of the submission in question. Manuscript reviewers must have some experience as authors of articles published in peer-reviewed journals. Reviewer reappointments are contingent upon reviewers fulfilling their responsibilities in a timely and effective manner.

Reviewer's Responsibilities

After you receive the manuscript, please review it first for possible conflict of interest. If you are certain you know the identity of the author(s), you should recuse yourself in order to maintain the integrity of the blind review process. If you believe, but are not certain, that you know the identity of the author(s), or if you believe you are in conflict of interest for any other reason,



please contact the Editorial Assistant (contact information below) or the Editor for guidance.

The review process is confidential and use of the electronic manuscript file is restricted: it must not be distributed for any purpose other than this blinded peer review. Both electronic and paper versions should be destroyed after you have completed the review, and any additional reviews of revised and resubmitted versions, if applicable.

We ask that reviews be returned to us within 4 weeks for regular manuscripts, and 3 weeks for research notes and commentaries.

Evaluating the Manuscript

Thank you so much for your willingness to review a manuscript for *CJCCJ*. Not only are you helping the journal, but you are providing a professional development opportunity for the author(s) of the article you review.

A given manuscript may fall directly in your line of specialty, or it may not. In such a case, we would still like your feedback if possible, as our hope is to receive a well-balanced set of reviews not only from specialists, but also from individuals in allied or related subfields. Such reviews are especially valuable, providing us information regarding the breadth and general appeal of a given contribution.

In your review and recommendation, please consider (as applicable), the significance of the research, the theoretical framing of the issues, including the review of the literature, the accuracy of any factual statements, the quality and appropriateness of the data and the data analysis, the validity of the conclusions, and the quality of the presentation.

Process using ScholarOne™ Manuscripts

As of August 2016, the submission and review of articles submitted to *CJCCJ* are completed using an online system called ScholarOne™ Manuscripts. The system will send out an automated email when you have been invited to review an article. The email will contain links to access your ScholarOne™ account, and your username. If this is your first time using ScholarOne™, you will be required to create a password and modify your account with the required information (institution, address, etc.). For security purposes, your password will **never be contained in the email**. If you ever forget your password you can change it by going to the ScholarOne™ homepage:

<https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/cjccj>

In the “Log in” box you will see “Password Help.” Enter your email address and you will receive an e-mail with your account information. Make sure to use the email account that was used to generate your invitation. **Do not create a new account if you forget your password.**

Once you are logged in, the Main Menu will be displayed. Please click on the Reviewer Center, where you will find the manuscript listed under “Review and Score.” You can click on the manuscript title from this point or you can click on the “Perform Review” button to begin reviewing the manuscript.

If you wish to view the manuscript and the review form simultaneously, click on the HTML or



PDF icons – the manuscript will open in a new window. Leave the new window open, switch back to the main window, and open the score sheet by clicking on the Score Sheet tab. Follow the instructions for reviewers provided in the ScholarOne Manuscripts site. I strongly encourage you to elaborate on your review in the space provided. Your specific comments will offer valuable feedback to improve future work. It is essential that you click the "Save" button if you wish to exit the review before you submit it to the Editor. Otherwise, none of the information that you have entered will be saved in the system. When you have completed your review and are ready to submit it to the Editor, click on "Submit."

You will be asked a series of questions and asked to rate the manuscript on four criteria: Accept, Accept with Revisions, Revise and Resubmit, or Reject. This part of the review is for the information of the Editorial Committee only, and is not sent to the author(s).

At the bottom of the page you will find a section for comments. Please provide comments for the author(s) that amplify your reasons for the confidential recommendation that you made, and that explain in as much detail as possible how you feel the manuscript (and the research, if applicable) should be changed in order to make it publishable. These suggestions for change are, of course, especially important if you have recommended that the manuscript be revised and less important if you have recommended that it be rejected outright.

In particular, if you have recommended acceptance conditional on minor revisions, please explain specifically what revisions are necessary, in your opinion, for the manuscript to be accepted for publication; and any additional revisions or issues for consideration that you wish to leave to the discretion of the author(s).

If you have recommended rejection, it would be helpful if you could explain why, and – if applicable – what other journal or type of journal might be a more suitable outlet for the manuscript.

Please do not recommend major revisions and resubmission if you are not reasonably confident that the author(s) will be able to produce a revised manuscript that you will recommend for publication when it is sent back to you for a second review. It is not helpful to the author(s) to suggest resubmission if the likelihood that you will accept the revised manuscript is not high. In addition, it is important to avoid creating an unnecessary workload for the editorial staff and other reviewers who will be devoting their time to dealing with a manuscript that is nevertheless rejected following an invitation to resubmit.

There is a text box for you to enter Confidential comments to the Editor. However, in general, any comments about the manuscript intended for the Editorial Committee will probably also be useful to the author(s) in understanding why their manuscript received the decision that it did, and how to improve it; in which case they should be put in the comments to the author(s). Author(s) will naturally be mystified if, for example, their manuscript is rejected but the reviews do not make clear why the manuscript was unacceptable.



Confidential Recommendation

In your confidential recommendation to the Editorial Committee, please choose one of the following:

Accept

- No changes needed from author(s). Manuscripts that are accepted are immediately scheduled for publication. Note: Very few manuscripts are "accepted" at the initial review stage!

Accept with Revisions

- Manuscript is accepted for publication, conditional on the author(s) making minor specified changes. This recommendation should be made when some clarifications or changes are needed in the manuscript but the credibility of the content is not in question. The revised version will be reviewed only by members of the Editorial Committee, and will not need to be reviewed again by the referee.

Invitation to Make Major Revisions and Resubmit

- The manuscript is not accepted for publication, but has sufficient potential for eventual publication that the author(s) is/are invited to make substantial changes to the manuscript and resubmit it for reconsideration. If the manuscript is resubmitted, it will be sent to the reviewers for them to evaluate a second time. The author(s) will be informed that "revise and resubmit" does not contain any commitment to publish the revised manuscript. Eventual acceptance for publication is entirely contingent on the content of the revised manuscript. The author(s) will be requested to attach a memorandum in which they indicate how they have addressed the concerns raised by the reviewers of the first version of the manuscript and, specifically, where and how they have made any changes requested by the reviewers. Similarly, where appropriate, the author(s) will be requested to indicate why they disagree with important recommendations made by the reviewers. This memorandum will be made available to each of the reviewers of the revised version of the manuscript.

Reject

- This recommendation should be made when the manuscript should not be published in *CJCCJ*, and is not suitable for revision for publication in *CJCCJ* - because of the unsuitability for *CJCCJ* of its subject matter, and/or substantial and irremediable deficiencies in the research and/or the presentation.

Queries

What is a DOI?

A DOI is an article's unique identifier, registered with [CrossRef](http://www.crossref.org/01company/16fastfacts.html) (FAQ on CrossRef here: <http://www.crossref.org/01company/16fastfacts.html>) and used to create a persistent link to the article -- even if the article moves. (A journal might switch from one online hosting service to another, for example; the URL will change, but the DOI link will follow it.) A reader using the



online version of an article's reference list can click on any DOI link to immediately get to the cited source; a reader using the print version can be sure of finding exactly the right article by searching the DOI instead of the author(s) or article title. Each of our online articles has its own DOI, which can be used to link back to it from other documents that cite it; including DOI links in our reference lists is the other end of that process (sort of like using recycled paper as well as recycling used paper). The more citations include DOIs, the more researchers will use them, which ultimately will drive more readers to our content.

[“How to Alienate Your Editor: A Practical Guide for Established Authors”](#), written by Stephen K. Donovan and published in the [Journal of Scholarly Publishing](#), is an excellent article on classic mistakes made during the submission process. Also useful is [“Surviving Referees’ Reports”](#) written by Brian Martin and also published in the [Journal of Scholarly Publishing](#).

Contact Us

Questions relating to any of the above may be directed to the *CJCCJ* Editorial Assistant at the email address below:

Amanda Butler
albutler@sfu.ca
(+1) 778-782-9897

The [Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice](#) is owned by the Canadian Criminal Justice Association:

320 Parkdale Avenue, Suite 101
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
K1Y 4X9
Telephone: (613) 725-3715
Fax: (613) 725-3720
Email: ccja-acjp@rogers.com
Website: ccja-acjp.ca