Journal of Humanities, Science and Healthcare double-blind peer review process.

The nine-step, double-blind peer review process is summarized as follows:

1. Submission of Paper

All completed journal articles are submitted online, fully proofed, via email. Names and identifying markers are removed to ensure double-blind integrity.

2. Editorial Assessment

By completed we mean that the full heading as it would appear in the final publication, fully researched and well written (including any pictures and graphs), and subsumed to the writing style of the journal (variance for MLA, APA, etc., may be allowed if it is necessary for a discipline). Here we ensure the journal's Author Guidelines are adhere to, including the required sections and stylizations. The quality of the paper is not assessed at this point.

3. Appraisal by the Editor-in-Chief (EIC) or the Senior Associate Editor (SAE)

The EIC/SAE checks that the paper is appropriate for the journal and is sufficiently original and interesting. Rejection or recommendation to consider another publishing venue is possible at this point. The EIC/SAE are the only ones knowing the author's identity.

4. EIC / SAE Assigns article to Assistant Senior Associate Editor (ASAE) and Associate Editor (AE) to conduct review.

The EIC/SAE doesn't know the identity of the Reviewers. Each AE is responsible for a discipline and each has a team of reviewers:

- Humanities
- Science
- Healthcare

5. Invitation to Reviewers

The handling editor sends invitations to individuals he or she believes would be appropriate reviewers. As responses are received, further invitations are issued, if necessary, until the required number of acceptances is obtained – commonly this is 2. The invitation to review includes a standard rating and comment form.

Journal of Healthcare, Science and the Humanities			
Peer-Review Form			
Please give details that guide possible revisions or explain reasons for rejection.			
Manuscript No.	JHSH-19S-V9-4		
Manuscript Title:	Synthesizing Oral and Systemic Health in a Food Desert		
Date Received:	June 5		Due Date: June 14
Overall Rating Select one number 1-5 (5 being the highest and 1 being the lowest)			
Theory: How would you rate this article's theoretical soundness?			
Writing: How would you rate this article's standard of academic writing?			
Relevance: How would you rate this article's relevance to the Journal of Healthcare, Science and the Humanities			
Recommended Disposition of the Manuscript: 1. Accepted 2. Accepted with minor revision 3. Accepted with major revision 4. Rejected		I	

6. Response to Invitations

Potential reviewers consider the invitation against their own expertise, conflicts of interest and availability. They then accept or decline. If possible, when declining, they might also suggest alternative reviewers who are at least as proficient as themselves.

7. Blind-Review is Conducted

The reviewer sets time aside to read the paper several times. The first read is used to form an initial impression of the work. If major problems are found at this stage, the reviewer may feel comfortable rejecting the paper without further work. Otherwise they will read the paper several more times, taking notes to build a detailed point-by-point review. The review is then submitted to the journal, with a recommendation to accept or reject it – or else with a request for revision (usually flagged as either major or minor) before it is reconsidered. Reviewer doesn't know the identity of the author.

8. Journal Evaluates the Reviews

The handling editor considers all the returned reviews before making an overall decision. If the reviews differ widely, the editor may invite an additional reviewer to get an extra opinion before deciding.

9. The Decision is Communicated

The editor sends a decision email to the author including any relevant reviewer comments. Whether the comments are anonymous or not will depend on the type of peer review that the journal operates.