

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
PSYCHOTHERAPY**

REFEREE'S REPORT

Manuscript Title:

Referee's Name: E-mail:

Please return your comments by: (about 2 weeks after receipt).

PLEASE EVALUATE THE ARTICLE ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA: 5 = Best, 0 = Neutral, -5 = Worst (To indicate the 'score': highlight; make bold; turn into red text; or similar)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----------|
| Importance of the Subject: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Originality of the Approach: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Soundness of the Scholarship: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Quality of the Research: <i>(if relevant)</i> | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Degree of Interest to our Readership: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Clarity of Structure: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Strength of the Argument: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Use of Language: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Appropriateness of Article: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Length: | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| Is the Abstract clear and precise? | | | | | | | | | | | Yes / No |
| Are the Keywords appropriate? | | | | | | | | | | | Yes / No |

YOUR RECOMMENDATION: Please tick or highlight only one of these:

- ACCEPT ARTICLE AS IT STANDS
- ACCEPT IT WITH MINOR REVISIONS
- RE-SUBMIT / REQUIRES MAJOR REVISION (Please select only if article has real promise)
- REJECT (Please supply some comments as to why you think this, which can be sent to the author, rather than them receiving a bare rejection or request for revision)
- REFER TO A SPECIALIST (see notes to Reviewers, page 3)
- BETTER SUITED TO ANOTHER JOURNAL (If possible say which)

YOUR COMMENTS:

*Please Add Any Further Comments On This Sheet: Firstly comments on the article: **To Be Sent to the Author Anonymously***

ANY FURTHER COMMENTS:

That are just for the Editors (i.e.: confidential and not to be sent to the Author)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS:

These to be added later by the Editor or the Editor of the Special Issue

P.T.O. for ‘Suggestions to Reviewers’

Suggestions for Reviewers:

You have been asked to review this article because you are either: **(a)** a member of the IJP Editorial Board; **(b)** a member of the IJP International Advisory Committee; **(c)** a previous author of an article in the IJP; or **(d)** a colleague, who has some particular expertise in the subject of the article. So, thank you for agreeing to review this article. Your review is very important to us; not only in the immediate help it gives to the editors and to the author, but also in helping to get the Journal onto a professional ‘citation index’.

In the IJP, we are committed to a process of **double-blind peer-reviews**. This means that we appoint (at least) two reviewers (referees) – from as wide a list as possible – unknown to each other, and who also (hopefully) don’t know the author. This version of the article sent out for review has been ‘anonymised’ (even if you can make a guess as to who the author is). Your review and comments will also be forwarded (also anonymised) back to the author. This way people can express their opinions openly and clearly without being criticised, attacked or castigated. This is how things are done professionally and scientifically.

Please trust that your opinions of the article – whatever they are – are worthwhile, especially if they are sincere and honest: do not worry too much about making them “nice”; do not censor yourself too much; do not limit yourself in expressing your views – other than within the normal rules of politeness and professionalism. You are a professional; your views are valuable; we have asked you for them.

We hope this clarifies some of these points. There may be more clarifications needed: if so, please ask. In the criteria for evaluation (page 1), some questions have been raised about what is meant by:

- (i) “Soundness of the Scholarship” – by this we mean, how good (or bad) – in your opinion – are the extent of the references; the knowledge of the field; the inclusion of other people’s views; the academic rigour and depth; the balance of opinions; etc.
- (ii) The “Readership”, who are they? Please assume that these are mostly European psychotherapists (inc. psychologists & psychiatrists), clinicians, academics, researchers, post-doctoral students, psychotherapy trainees, and other people interested in the aims and objectives of the Journal.
- (iii) “Appropriateness of the Article” – by this we mean, is the language good, sound, clear, professional, respectful, fairly wide, and not just ‘pushing’ one particular theme (modality, treatment, perspective, political view, personal view, etc.). Does it fit within the context of other articles published in the Journal, but not necessary limiting itself just to this; timeliness can also be appropriate; is the topic reasonably interesting to a wider audience, and not too self-promotional; is the research out-of date; etc.
- (iv) With regards to the **Recommendation** – there are six options: **please choose just one**. A question was raised about “REFER TO A SPECIALIST” – this means that whilst you might, or might not, like the article, and may well have some comments to make; the article itself is of such a nature that it needs – in your opinion – a proper “specialist opinion”: i.e. it is about some complicated research; or a detailed commentary about a particular method, modality or technique that you are not very familiar with.

If you are **not** a subscriber to the Journal, please go to the **IJP website**: www.ijp.org.uk and have a look at the “Ethos” page; then please look at the list of “Back Issues & Articles”. We also offer our reviewers a free download of: **(a)** either up to 6 articles p.a.; or **(b)** of a whole issue. Finally, please **really** keep to the time-limit of writing submitting your review. **Please complete this review basically within about 2 weeks of receiving the anonymised article**. If you discover that you cannot possibly do this, please contact Marzena (Assistant Editor) immediately, otherwise production may well be held up, or the article might have to be dropped from the next issue. Your review - and the other reviewer’s comments - will then need some time to be forwarded back to the author, who then might need some time to make their own changes as a result of your comments. When you have reviewed the article, and returned the form, **please delete the article from your computer**. *Thank you!*