HPP Peer Review Questions

The HPP Editorial Board is committed to a review process that is rigorous and respectful, educational and engaging for all participants, and as transparent as blind peer review can be. One way that we can demystify the process for prospective authors is by publicly sharing our review criteria.

Basic Review Questions (Research Articles, Research Briefs, Implementation Science Articles and Literature Reviews)

- Does the manuscript clearly identify a compelling public health need, gap, problem, or opportunity?
  - Does the manuscript establish urgency and interest? Is this an area of current or emerging priority in public health?
- Are project goals or study aims clearly stated?
  - Are they linked to the problem or issue identified above?
- Is the literature review current, thorough, appropriate? (not required for Research Briefs and slightly different for Literature Review Articles)
  - Does the review position the project or study within a larger body of inquiry? Are gaps identified? Is the review enough to establish the need for this project or study without overwhelming the text? Are references current (the majority less than 5 years)? Are areas or particular references missing that the authors should consider?
- Does the manuscript identify and describe a useful conceptual or theoretical framework? (not required for Research Briefs or Literature Review Articles)
  - Is the conceptual framework or underlying change theory clearly articulated and justified by the problem statement and literature review? Is it appropriate for the project and clearly used to frame study/project design?
- Are the methods clearly described and appropriate for the project/study aims?
  - Are interventions/strategies/methods aligned with the conceptual framework (if included), culturally centered, and appropriate? Are quantitative and/or qualitative methods clearly described? If appropriate, are sampling strategy, recruitment methods, and informed consent detailed? If appropriate, was the study approved by a research ethics committee prior to data collection? Is the project reasonably current (less than 5 years old)? Is the analysis strategy clearly described and appropriate?
- Are the results clearly presented?
- Are tables, figures, and/or quotes useful and necessary, clearly labeled, and easy to follow? Do they enhance understanding of results? If included, is Supplemental Content helpful?

- Is the discussion complete and convincing?
  - Do the authors reflect on the strengths and limitations of the study or project? Are the findings discussed in relation to relevant research, policy, or practice issues, with appropriate citations? Do the authors identify novel findings that contribute to the literature?

- Does the manuscript clearly identify implications for practice, policy and/or research?
  - Are next steps, lessons learned and or recommendations clearly identified? Are they clearly labeled and easy to find? Are recommendations clearly tied to the findings, approach, and/or conceptual framework?

- Are the abstract, title, and keywords appropriate?
  - Is the abstract an accurate summary of the manuscript? Will the keywords enhance discoverability?

- Do organization and word choice align with HPP guidance? [Hyperlink to: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1524839919827900]
  - Is the manuscript well-written? Are there minimal (or no) grammar errors? Are word choices [Hyperlink to: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/15248399211001068] inclusive, respectful, not stigmatizing?

- Is the manuscript consistent with HPP’s mission and vision?
  - Relevant aspects include: 1) strategically advancing the art and science of health promotion, 2) authoritative research that brings new knowledge, evidence, or ideas to the field, 3) commitment to content that addresses health equity, social determinants of health, and evidence-based practice.

- Will this manuscript advance health promotion practice?
  - Does it offer enough that is “new” to advance the field? Will it be widely read? Downloaded? Used in professional preparation programs? Useful in policy development or advocacy? Cited in other research or publications?

Specific review areas for other manuscript types:

- **Department Submissions** (Practice Notes, Career Development, Resources, Frameworks, and Perspectives)
  - Is the manuscript consistent with department priorities?
  - Will it be of interest to health education and promotion practitioners?
  - Will it be timely and relevant to our diverse HPP audience?

- **Literature Review Articles**
o Does the manuscript clearly identify a compelling new question or problem that warrants a literature review?

o Are the review type, aims, and methods aligned?

o Is sufficient information provided to replicate the search?

• Implementation Science Articles

o Is the implementation science framework clearly identified and used throughout the manuscript?

o Do findings advance implementation science as well as the particular objectives of the intervention?

Review criteria are reviewed annually and updated as necessary. However, changes when they occur, are minor and in the interest of clarity and support for authors and reviewers. We keep this page updated with the most current version.

We hope that knowing the review criteria in advance will help authors prepare their manuscripts and better understand the way HPP approaches peer review.
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