



## ***Journal of Sport for Development (JSFD)*** **Reviewer Guidelines**

Below are the reviewer guidelines for the Journal of Sport for Development. As we continue to grow as a journal, continued support and high-quality peer reviews by editorial board members and ad hoc reviewers are essential to strengthen the journal, support the development of sport for development scholars, and advance the sport for development field more broadly.

### **General Guidelines**

#### **Timeline**

- Please submit your review within the timetable requested by the editors. Submissions are reviewed by a minimum of two reviewers via a double-blind review process. Completed peer reviews are due to the editors within 35 days. Please inform the co-editors as early as possible if you are unable to submit your review on time due to unforeseen circumstances.
- If you do not meet the review deadlines, you may be excluded from future review requests/opportunities. It is important to the JSFD leadership team to provide timely feedback to authors and we rely on board members and ad hoc reviewers as the backbone for the continued success of the journal.

#### **Conflicts of Interest**

- Please contact the editors or the managing editor to disclose any potential conflicts of interest that may influence your review of the submission. This could include financial conflicts (e.g., employment, consultancies, grants) related to the organization(s) involved in the submission or other relationships with individuals or organizations that can be viewed as actually or potentially influencing your ability to review the submission objectively.

#### **Formatting and Length Requirements**

- Manuscripts must conform to the current Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The editors and the managing editor will strive to make sure that these requirements are met before a manuscript is sent out for review, although you are encouraged to provide feedback on formatting as well.
- A good review is generally one to four single-spaced pages in length and provides constructive feedback that helps the author or authors improve their manuscript and grow as sport for development scholars and stakeholders, along with advancing the sport for development field more broadly. For resubmitted manuscripts, reviews may ultimately be shorter, especially if a reviewer feels the author or authors have addressed the previous feedback provided.

- Comments should refer to the specific subsections and/or page, paragraph number, line number, or table/figure/illustration/appendix where you have questions, concerns, and/or suggestions for the author(s).
- Please avoid any feedback that might provide information as to your identity as a reviewer or seek information regarding the identity of the author(s).
- You may also use the “track changes” feature to make comments on the actual document but please ensure there is no way to identify you as a reviewer. If you require help making your track change feedback anonymous, we encourage you to find step by step instructions using a simple Google search.
- The link to submit your review accepts one file upload. If your review does not fit in the text box provided, you are welcome to upload your feedback in a word document. For any feedback that exceeds the text box or file upload option, you are welcome to email [jsfdeditors@gmail.com](mailto:jsfdeditors@gmail.com) with additional comments intended for the manuscript authors or JSFD editors.

### **Tone of the Review**

- Reviewer comments should be clear, specific, and constructive to help the author(s) develop a high-quality manuscript. What are the strengths of the submission? JSFD is committed to support aspiring scholars and stakeholders from around the world to advance the sport for development field. Therefore, it is imperative that reviewer feedback is constructive and offers detailed recommendations on how to improve the manuscript, even if the decision is ultimately to reject the submission. Areas of consideration include:
  - a) potential literature that author(s) should consider and how those sources might be integrated in the manuscript;
  - b) the organization of information and recommendations for how a more coherent narrative might be developed;
  - c) the quality of writing; and
  - d) possible philosophical, theoretical, methodological, and/or analytical concerns and what the author or authors need to do to address those concerns.
- Be open-minded regarding author or authors’ theoretical framework(s) and/or methodological approaches.
- It is possible that you may receive a manuscript not directly related to your specific area of expertise. However, you can still contribute a constructive review to help the author or authors and the editors. For example, you could potentially comment on the technical correctness of the methodology, the quality of the literature used, whether the author or authors provide an adequate rationale and justification for their study, whether the narrative is well organized and coherent, and whether the information presented provides new insight or extends the body of knowledge on sport for development.
- It is critical to understand that authors and reviewers come from diverse backgrounds with different writing/research traditions and methodological orientations. Therefore, the focus of your comments to the author(s) should use moderate language to stimulate thinking and discussion regarding the theoretical frame and methodological approach used for the study.

## **Academic Misconduct**

- All authors are expected to read and understand JSFD's [ethics policy](#) before submission.
- Please notify the editors if you suspect possible academic misconduct in the submitted manuscript.
- When the editors are made aware of possible misconduct, they will address the issue following the COPE Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing.

## **Specific Considerations for Different Types of Submissions**

### **Original Research**

- Do the author(s) clearly articulate the purpose of the research?
- Is the significance of the study identified and supported?
- Is the theoretical framework and/or literature review well developed with recognition of relevant seminal references?
- Are the research methods employed appropriate for the purpose of study and of sufficient quality to make a meaningful contribution?
- Is there consistency between ontology, epistemology, theory, methodology, sampling strategy, data collection techniques, data analysis, and/or study quality procedures?
- Are the results or findings analyzed appropriately and presented in a clear and understandable way?
- Are conclusions warranted and situated within the broader literature?

### **Evaluation Protocol**

- Do the author(s) articulate a sound rationale for the evaluation?
- Are the specific evaluation objectives identified?
- Do the author(s) provide sufficient details to understand the critical components of the sport for development program?
- Does the evaluation design support the purpose of the evaluation?
- Is there consistency between ontology, epistemology, theory, methodology, sampling strategy, data collection techniques, data analysis, and/or study quality procedures?

### **Systematic or Integrative Reviews**

- For systematic reviews, have the author(s) complied with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and included a PRISMA checklist with their manuscript?
- For integrative reviews, is the manuscript coherently structured?
- Are the methods for conducting the integrative literature review sufficiently described?
- Does the integrative literature review synthesize knowledge from the literature into a contribution that adds value and new knowledge on the topic in sport for development?

### **Book Reviews**

- Is the bulk of the review focused on providing an evaluation and/or commentary of the text rather than simply a summary of the book?
- Is a brief outline or synopsis provided of the major emphasis of the text?

- Do the author(s) identify their reactions to the issues raised in the book and any aspects of the focus area that the author(s) found inadequately developed?
- Do the author(s) discuss how the book enhanced their understanding of the issues discussed in the text?

### **Commentaries**

- Is a clear and concise purpose identified?
- Do the author(s) present a clear and coherent argument?
- Does the commentary stimulate thought or debate for the sport for development field?
- Do the arguments or suggestions seem reasonable?

### **Research Notes**

- Is a clear and concise purpose identified?
- Is the literature review well developed with recognition of relevant seminal references?
- Does the research note advance a new idea, theoretical perspective, research project, or methodological approach for the sport for development field?
- Do the author(s) present a clear and coherent argument?
- If included, do the data support the conclusions?
- Are conclusions warranted and situated within the broader literature?

### **Thought Leadership From the Field**

- Do the author(s) provide a clear and coherent narrative throughout the article?
- Do the author(s) explain the significance of the main arguments presented and their applicability to the sport for development field?
- Does the discussion stimulate thought or debate for sport for development practice, policy, and/or research?
- Do the author(s) employ ‘blue ocean’ thinking? *Blue ocean* is an analogy to describe the wider, deeper potential of a sector that is not yet explored.

### **Thought Leadership From the Field – Additional Tips for Reviewers**

- JSFD is committed to advancing the sport for development field and challenge stakeholders from the sector. As such contributions in this section might be provocative, unconventional, or conceptual. It is imperative that reviewers be open-minded when providing constructive feedback.
- Authors are encouraged to choose their own style of writing and as a result may take an unconventional approach regarding theoretical framework(s), methodological approaches, and/or how literature reviews are utilized. There is not a minimum amount of citations expected, unlike the norm for original research pieces.
- Thought Leadership from the Field is about presenting near real-time opinion on issues and ideas relevant to the sector within the current context. As such, these contributions may appear to have a finite relevance. This is encouraged and serves to bridge the gap between research and practice leading to visible change in the sector.