Peer-review nomination form

Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | Click here to enter text |
| **Address** | Click here to enter text |
| **Email** | Click here to enter text |
| **Phone**  | Click here to enter text |
| **Affiliations** | Click here to enter text |

Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area(s) of practice** | Click here to enter text |
| **Setting** | [ ]  Private Practice[ ]  Clinical[ ]  Research[ ]  Other: please provide more information |
| **Years of experience** | Click here to enter text |
| **Advanced APD status** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **Conflict of interest to disclose?** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |

Checklist and consent

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I understand that all personal details outlined in this form are kept confidential and securely stored on the DA internal server.** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **I understand that I may not be called as a peer-reviewer.** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **I understand that this application is not binding. If called for a peer-review opportunity, I can choose to accept or decline without question.** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **If I accept to peer-review, I understand that it is voluntary (without renumeration, unless otherwise).** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **If I accept to peer-review, I understand that all content I review is strictly confidential and must be destroyed once feedback is given.** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **I understand that all content I review cannot be shared or discussed.** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **I have read and understood the guidelines outlined below.** | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **I have attached the following to my application** | [ ]  Cover letter (outlining reason(s) for application)[ ]  Current CV (outlining history of expertise in identified area)[ ]  2-3 References |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature and Date

## Peer Review Guidelines

**1. Agreeing to act as a peer reviewer**
Before agreeing to act as a peer reviewer, please ensure that you have the expertise required to review the content. The peer review process is essential to the course development process as it ensures the integrity and quality of education provided by DA.

If you believe you have a conflict of interest in reviewing the content, please discuss potential conflicts with the CAL Manager. Ensure that you have enough time to properly review the content. If you need more time, please discuss this at the time of acceptance or as potential delays arise. If you are unable to complete the review, please let us know as soon as possible. There are no negative consequences for refusing to review a paper.

**2. Confidentiality**
Content provided to you for review are confidential. The content should not be distributed in any way and no details about the content should be discussed with anyone except with the CAL Manager.

After you have completed the peer review process, we ask that you carefully dispose of the content; this includes deleting any soft copy from electronic storage systems such as email, computer hard drives or network servers.

**3. The review process**
You will be sent an email with a copy of the content. After reading and assessing the content, you will be asked to comment on aspects including, but not limited to:

* Learning objectives: Does the content meet the learning objectives?
* Level of interactivity (practical learning): Is there a sufficient level of interactivity to ensure engagement and knowledge retention? Are scenarios and practical examples relevant and appropriate?
* Evidenced based (theoretical learning): Does the course content reflect the current level of evidence?
* Pre-reading list: Is the suggested pre-reading list appropriate?
* Referencing: Is referencing both in-text and at the end consistent and as per Vancouver Referencing System?

CAL uses a double-blind peer review process, so you will not be told who the authors are and your review will be given anonymously to the writer.

The possible recommendations are described below:

* *Accept*– the content is suitable with no alterations.
* *Minor Revision* – there are small changes that are considered essential and that the writer can be relied upon to make.
* *Major Revision* – significant problems have been identified that the writer must respond to.

**4. Feedback**
Your comments should reflect your unique perspective as an experience APD and focus on what can be done to improve the content, even if it is already of high quality. Please make your suggestions as specific, detailed and constructive as possible.

There is a section for comments to the author and another section for confidential comments to the CAL Manager.