

CJRT • JCTR

Peer Review Policy

The success of *CJRT* is a direct reflection of our dedicated team of peer reviewers who critically evaluate manuscript submissions. These reviews assist the editorial board in making publication decisions, and guide authors in strengthening their professional writing. Reviewers provide objective, insightful, and rigorous critiques of submitted manuscripts, enhancing the clinical relevance and scientific quality of articles published in *CJRT* and helping respiratory therapists and those in related professions advance quality and innovation in patient care.

All manuscripts are peer reviewed following the procedure outlined below. Please note that special issues and/or conference proceedings may have different peer review procedures involving, for example, Guest Editors, conference organizers or scientific committees. This will be communicated to contributing authors in these cases.

Initial manuscript evaluation

The Editor-in-Chief evaluates all manuscripts upon submission. Those rejected before being sent to review have serious scientific flaws, or are outside the aims and scope of the journal. Those that meet the minimum criteria are assigned to Associate Editor, who will select two (or more) peer reviewers with expertise in the subject matter.

Type of peer review

The *CJRT* uses “double blind” reviewing, where the referees and author remain anonymous throughout the process.

Selection of referees

The *CJRT* attempts to prevent conflicts of interest by not inviting reviewers from the same institutions as authors. However, previous relationships or places of employment may not be apparent. In our invitation to potential reviewers, we ask that they decline to review if they know, or guess the identity of the author.

Referee reports

Referees are asked to evaluate whether the manuscript:

- Is original
- Is methodologically sound
- Follows appropriate ethical guidelines
- Has results which are clearly presented and support the conclusions
- Correctly references previous relevant work

Referees are not expected to correct or copyedit manuscripts. Language correction is not part of the peer review process.

How long does the review process take?

Once appropriate reviewers have been identified they are sent an invitation, and asked to respond within one week (at which point it will be sent to an alternate). Reviewers who accept the invitation are asked to complete the review within 14 days. Reviewers who agree to evaluate a manuscript but do not return comments by the due date may be replaced with alternates to keep the review process moving along. Should the referees' reports contradict one another or a report is unnecessarily delayed, a further expert opinion will be sought.

Final report

There are several possible decisions: to accept or reject the manuscript outright, to request minor or major revisions, and to accept or reject after revision(s). Referees and/or Associate Editors may request more than one revision of a manuscript. This decision will be sent to the author along with any recommendations made by the referees, and may include verbatim comments by the referees.

Appeal process

If an author wishes to appeal an outcome of peer review, they should contact the Managing Editor (editor@csrt.com) and detail his/her concern. Appeals will only be successful if reviews were inadequate or unjust. Should this be the case, the paper will be sent to alternate reviewers agree to re-review the paper.

Becoming a reviewer for *CJRT*

If you are not currently a referee for the *CJRT*, but would like to be added to the list of referees, please contact the editorial office (editor@csrt.com).

Reviewer recognition

The *CJRT* is proud to recognize the efforts of our reviewers in the following ways:

1. A list of peer reviewers is published and updated annually on the *CJRT* website
2. Reviewers are sent thank-you letters from the Editor-in-Chief at the end of each year, and a letter is also available to be mailed to your employer recognizing your contributions.