

Double Blind Peer-Review Process

The Online Turkish Journal of Health Sciences (OTJHS) is a double-blind peer-reviewed international academic journal published quarterly.

A minimum of two peer reviewers, who are recognized specialists specific to the topic and area of the submissions, are appointed by the editors. All peer review reports are electronically and anonymously delivered to the contributors. Reviewers' names are withheld by the journal to protect the integrity of the double-blind peer review process. Upon request, written reports can be provided to the reviewer that attests to their contribution. All published authors accept to act as reviewers for future issues.

Peer review is the founding mechanism of academic endeavor. Peer review helps editors make decisions in dialogue with authors. Authors gain important insights about their works and find the chance to develop their work by dint of criticism ensconced in the reviewers' reports and comments.

Publication decisions

The editors and the publisher formally assure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo peer review by at least two reviewers who are specialists in their field. After the completion of the review process, the Editor-in-Chief is responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal will be published, based on the validation of the work in question, its importance to researchers and readers, the reviewers' comments, and such legal requirements as are currently in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The Editor-in-Chief may get advice from other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

Promptness

A referee invited for review should immediately report on his/her availability and those who feel unqualified to review the research should inform the editor about their decisions as soon as possible.

Confidentiality

Manuscripts delivered to the referees should be treated as confidential documents. The manuscripts should not be shown to others, nor their contents should be discussed publicly. Only under explicit authorization by the Editor-in-Chief, a reviewer can seek advice from her colleagues. The Editor-in-Chief will give this permission only under exceptional conditions. This rule also concerns the persons who declined to take part in the process as a referee.

Standards of objectivity

Personal critiques oriented toward the manuscripts' authors are not an appropriate manner of conduct. Reviews should follow an objective procedure in their reports and upon the acceptance of referee duty, they accept that their comments are evidently supported by arguments that are of help to the authors in improving their work.

Acknowledgment of sources

Reviewers have a duty to report to the authors any published work that is not part of the authors' references. A reviewer should pay particular attention to the works in the field that are not cited by the authors, or overlaps between different works. A reviewer should notify the editors regarding similarity with any other previously published work, or other manuscripts they have a knowledge of.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Any invited referee who has conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscript and the work described therein should immediately notify the editors to declare their conflicts of interest and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the authors. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for the reviewer's personal advantage. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.