



Guidelines for Reviewers

(updated June 2026)

About the Journal

The mission of [Nursing for Women's Health](#) is to translate evidence into nursing practice to improve health outcomes for individuals, families, and populations. The target audience is nurses, advanced practice nurses, midwives, and interdisciplinary teams working in women's and gender-related health, childbearing care, and neonatal health. It is an official publication of [AWHONN](#). Types of manuscripts reviewed include clinically focused original research; reports of quality improvement and evidence-based practice projects; systematic, integrative, and scoping reviews; practice articles; case reports; commentaries; letters to the editor; and personal essays. Manuscript types and submission criteria are described in more detail in the [Guidelines for Authors](#).

Becoming a Reviewer

Prospective reviewers can request a reviewer application by emailing nwh@awhonn.org. Reviewers must be a registered nurse or other related health care professional with knowledge in the fields of women's health, childbearing, or neonatal care. They should have scholarly publishing experience, ideally having been previously published in a peer-reviewed journal. Being a reviewer is strictly voluntary; you can request to be removed from the reviewer pool at any time. Reviewers who do not respond to review invitations, do not provide substantive reviews, or do not use respectful language in their reviewer comments will be removed from the pool.

Reviewer Recognition

Each year, top performing peer reviewers are eligible for a [Nursing for Women's Health](#) Reviewer of the Year award, which is selected by the Editor, recognized in the journal, and can be shared with others. In addition, each year, a list of the prior year's peer reviewers is published in the journal as a form of public recognition and thank you for their valued contributions.

Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence

Reviewers must treat the manuscript they are reviewing as a confidential document and **SHOULD NOT** upload a submitted manuscript or any part of it into a generative AI tool. Doing so may violate the authors' confidentiality and proprietary rights and, where the paper contains personally identifiable information, may breach data privacy rights. Reviewers who do not adhere to this policy will be removed from the reviewer pool. Read more on [Elsevier's Generative AI Policies for Journals](#).

What is Expected of Reviewers?

- **Respond to emailed invitations.** Make sure that the domains [@editorialmanager.com](#) and [@awhonn.org](#) are allowed by your email program. Check spam if review invitations are not being delivered to your inbox.
- **Keep your reviewer profile at [Editorial Manager](#) up to date**, including current email address, mailing address, phone number, and professional credentials. If you plan to use your work email as your primary email address, we highly recommend that you add a personal email address as a backup, as some reviewers' work emails filter review invitations as junk.
- **Choose a minimum of 1 and up to 10 "personal classifications" for your Editorial Manager profile.** These classifications are what enable the system to match reviewers to manuscripts. Choose only the classifications in which you feel most qualified to review. IMPORTANT: If there are no personal classifications selected in your Editorial Manager profile, the system will never match you to manuscripts.
- **Set your "Unavailable Dates" in your Editorial Manager profile** for dates when you will be unavailable to review.
- **Respond to all invitations to review**, by either accepting or declining the invitation, within 5 days of receipt. If you are unable to accept a request for review, please decline the invitation rather than ignoring it.
- **Submit your review within the requested timeframe.** Most reviews are expected within 21 days of accepting an invitation; sometimes the editor will request a shorter "fast-track" turnaround.
- **Read [Nursing for Women's Health](#)** to see what has been published.

Number of Reviews

There is no minimum or maximum number of manuscripts you will be invited to review each year. The number depends on how many manuscripts are submitted and the topics that they cover. It is your choice to accept or decline any invitation.

How to Submit a Great Review

The most important part of your review are your narrative comments to the editor and to the author.

Your role as reviewer is to *review* a manuscript—not to *edit* it. If you feel a manuscript has problems with grammar, style, spelling, etc., note that in your comments, but don't correct these mistakes line by line. It is more important to apply your expertise to the substance rather than the format of the manuscript.

Questions to Consider

When reading a manuscript, consider these questions:

- Is the scholarship of high quality? Are the scientific methods rigorous?
- Are implications for clinical practice made clear and discussed in enough detail to be useful and replicable?
- Is the writing clear and concise and is the article well organized?
- For research, reviews, and quality improvement projects, are the appropriate reporting guidelines followed?
- When citing outcomes of previously published work, does the author characterize those outcomes correctly and appropriately?
- Are recent and appropriate references cited? Are there any crucial references missing?
- Does the manuscript add something to the existing body of knowledge or at least present the topic in a timely or fresh way?
- Is there information in the text that would be better conveyed in an image, table, or box?
- If the article already has images, tables, and boxes, are they clear and useful?
- Will readers walk away having learned something, or does the manuscript raise more questions than it answers?

Submitting Your Review

All reviews must be completed in [Editorial Manager](#) so that all feedback is captured within one system and data privacy is preserved. If you are unfamiliar with Editorial Manager, you may wish to view their [Reviewer Tutorial](#).

Reviewers are not permitted to make comments or edits directly in the manuscript Word file or the PDF. All review comments must be entered into the online reviewer rating form at [Editorial Manager](#) where you must provide narrative comments to the editor and to the author, answer a brief questionnaire, and submit a recommendation of either “accept,” “revise,” or “reject.”

Comments to the Editor

Write your confidential opinions in this section, including your compelling reasons for why you think the manuscript should be accepted, revised, or rejected. Editors greatly value when reviewers provide substantive and candid comments here.

Comments to the Author

Write substantive comments to the author in this section using a respectful and constructive tone. Focus critical comments on the manuscript, rather than on the author. For example, instead of: *You should strengthen your conclusion*, write: *The manuscript would benefit from a stronger conclusion*. Include general suggestions and more specific suggestions listed by the corresponding line numbers in the manuscript. Read through your comments and check for errors or typos.

Do not express your opinion to the author about whether the article should be published; make these remarks in your confidential comments to the editor only.

Submitting a Decision Recommendation

- **Accept:** If, aside from minor changes or polishing edits, you feel the manuscript could be published in its present form, check this option.
- **Revise:** If the manuscript contains good material but should be revised by the author and resubmitted for additional review, check this option. Please check this category only if the paper has a good chance to be acceptable after the author satisfies your present criticisms.
- **Reject:** If you feel the manuscript cannot be improved with revision and should not be published, check this option and provide specific reasons for this recommendation.

General Principles to Keep in Mind

- **Double anonymous process.** The identities of the author and the reviewers are concealed from each other. Contact the editorial office if you think you might be biased because your interests' conflict with those of an author or if you think you know the identity of any of the authors.
- **Confidentiality.** The manuscript is a privileged communication for your personal review. You are free to solicit advice from others, but do not provide the manuscript to anyone else to review without approval from the editors. The manuscript is the intellectual property of the author and should not be reproduced or distributed in any manner and should not be uploaded into a generative artificial intelligence tool.
- **Suspicion of plagiarism.** If you suspect any parts of the manuscript have been plagiarized, please contact the editorial office at nwh@awhonn.org.
- **Editor's decision.** Reviewers are selected for their varying perspectives, and they may render differing opinions. The handling editor's decision to publish is not based on a "unanimous" vote by the reviewers; instead, the editor carefully considers all the reviews and weighs all factors. Once the editor has made a final decision about a manuscript, you can view it in Editorial Manager along with the other peer reviews.

Additional Resources

Here are some helpful resources:

- [Elsevier's Reviewer Hub](#)
- [Nurse Author & Editor](#)
- [Reviewing Journal Manuscripts](#), by Charon A. Pierson
- [Elsevier's Researcher Academy](#)

Conclusion

Thank you for your interest in reviewing for *Nursing for Women's Health*. Reviewing requires time, thought, expertise, and clear communication and, in doing so, reviewers perform an important service to their profession. We greatly appreciate the work of reviewers, and we often receive notes of thanks from authors telling us that the reviewers' feedback was very helpful to them.

QUESTIONS? CONTACT US at nwh@awhonn.org