

***Sociology of Health & Illness* - Guidelines for Referees**

The Editors strongly encourage online reviewing for the Journal. Full instructions and a help facility are available at the *Sociology of Health and Illness* Manuscript Central™ site: <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/shi>. Reviewers may also find it useful to consult the guide to online review at http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/pdf/SHI_reviewer.pdf.

Refereeing Policy

The journals policy is to obtain at least two independent opinions on all papers. This peer review process plays a vital part in the selection of manuscripts for publication. It is also a means by which authors can be encouraged to improve their submissions and their methodological and analytic skills. Referees are encouraged to write substantive, constructive reviews, conveying respect for authors' efforts and including suggestions for improving the work.

The journal operates a system of blind, anonymous refereeing. The identity of referees will not be disclosed to authors unless the referee chooses to sign his/her report. Referees should assume that their comments, or extracts from them, may be communicated to the author. They are asked not to include any overall recommendation in their comments but to indicate this on the form provided.

Referees who know or suspect that reviewing a paper may create a conflict of interest should discuss this with the editors before undertaking the review.

The journal aims to give authors an early response and asks referees to provide their assessment within four weeks of receiving the manuscript.

Guidelines for Referees

In reviewing papers submitted to *Sociology of Health & Illness*, referees are invited to consider the following issues. These are not intended to constitute an exhaustive or definitive list of issues, but to provide a framework within which the quality of the research may be considered. Referees are also encouraged to consult the journal's Guidelines for Authors.

All Papers

1. Does the submission have clear empirical or theoretical relevance to the field of sociology?
2. Is it sufficiently focused upon health, illness or medicine?
3. Is the purpose of the study/paper clearly stated and, where appropriate, are research questions and hypotheses clear?
4. Does the manuscript take adequate account of existing knowledge in the field?
5. Does this paper make a significant and original contribution to furthering knowledge in the field?
6. Is the paper logically organised and is the writing clear, direct, effective and concise?

Papers containing empirical data

7. Is the study design appropriate to the aims and objective of the study? Is it adequately described?
8. Is there evidence that the data collection was systematic and appropriate to the research question?
9. Has adequate account been taken of the impact of researcher and research process on the data obtained?
10. Have the criteria for sample selection been clearly described and justified and the sample characteristics adequately described?
11. Is there evidence of systematic and rigorous analysis which gives appropriate consideration to possible alternative analyses?
12. Are any interpretations of the data adequately supported by evidence?
13. Have the researchers taken any steps to establish the credibility of their findings or increase confidence in their interpretations?
14. Are ethical issues acknowledged and addressed satisfactorily?

Additional considerations for papers using quantitative methods

15. Are all statistical procedures used adequately described or referenced and justified?
16. Is statistical material adequately presented? The journal normally expects to see confidence intervals for the main results and exact p-values rather than statements of significance/non-significance.

Referees Recommendations

Referees are asked to provide a written report and to allocate papers to one of the following categories:

- Accept the manuscript as it stands or with minor editorial changes indicated in the report to the author
- Accept the manuscript based on conditions indicated in report to the author. At the editors' discretion, resubmitted manuscripts may be sent back to referees after revision.
- Reject the manuscript with resubmission encouraged following revision based on recommendations in report to author. Resubmitted manuscripts will almost invariably be sent back to referees after revision.
- Reject the manuscript and do not encourage resubmission