



# Journal of Indigenous HIV Research (JIHR): Reviewer Assessment Form

**Instructions:** Please use this form to provide concise feedback for each paper you have been asked to review. Refer to the scale provided at the end of this form for assistance in determining your final score.

**Please note:** In 2013, expansion of the Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network's (CAAN) mandate to include a holistic health model became a top priority when discussing HIV, Hepatitis C and other sexually transmitted blood-borne infections (STBBIs). CAAN intends to focus its energy on areas such as mental health, aging and chronic diseases associated with HIV and STBBIs from the perspectives of the individual, the family and the community. This will be referred to as the 'expanded mandate' going forward.

Please refer to the **Peer Review Policies – 2018** document for further details.

**Submission title:**

---

---

**Final Score /4:**

**How will this paper benefit the Indigenous HIV and AIDS community?**

**Relevance** to JIHR and CAAN mission, expanded mandate, to HIV and AIDS and Indigenous Peoples, to policy development and supporting action.

**Demonstration of implementation of Tri Council Policy Statement with particular attention to Chapter 9**

[http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2/TCPS\\_2\\_FINAL\\_Web.pdf](http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2/TCPS_2_FINAL_Web.pdf)

Is direction set by community stakeholders in the development, conduct and dissemination of research?

**Ethical issues/concerns?**

**Is the science in the research sound?** Is there an appropriate description of the methods used? What approach was used for analysis? Do the findings match the data presented?

Comment on the **overall academic quality of the content** of the paper – is enough information provided to assess the study? Are the conclusions clear and logical? Appropriate references and bibliography?

**Is the paper clearly written** – plain language where possible, clear use of terminology, etc.

**Summary statement** – 100 – 200 word statement (point form is fine) with comments

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Printed name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Description	Score
<b>Outstanding</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accepted without editorial revisions</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>
<b>Very Good</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept with editorial revisions</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>
<b>Acceptable but needs revision</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invite the authors to revise their manuscript to revise their manuscript to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<b>Needs major revision</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reject, but indicate to authors that further work might justify a resubmission</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
<b>Rejected</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reject outright, typically on grounds of lack of relevance or major technical and/or interpretational problems.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>