

# Peer Review Guidelines: Home Economics Annual Yearbook, vol 2

## Instructions for Peer Reviewers

These guidelines support reviewers in preparing a scholarly, impartial, and constructive peer review statement for manuscripts submitted to Home Economics Annual Yearbook. The statement should assess the manuscript's scholarly quality, relevance, reliability, originality, and suitability for publication, with attention to its aims, theoretical and methodological premises, contribution to home economics and/or home economics education, and adherence to responsible conduct of research. It should conclude with a clear overall recommendation and, where necessary, concrete and well-justified suggestions for improvement.

Home Economics Annual Yearbook, published by the Finnish Home Economics Teachers' Association, applies the national peer review label registered by The Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (see: <https://tsv.fi/en/services/label-for-peer-reviewed-scholarly-publications>). The publication is committed to complying with the conditions established for the use of the label and to observing principles consistent with the peer review guidelines of the Finnish Association for Scholarly Publishing and the guidelines on research integrity by the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (see: <https://tenk.fi/en/research-integrity-ri>).

Publishers using the peer review label are required to document the peer review process. All essential information and documentation relating to the review process must be retained in an electronic archive. Scholarly books intended for publication, or scholarly sections of publications, require at least two peer review statements from reviewers who are independent of the manuscript. Non-scholarly or general-interest manuscripts intended for a wider readership are usually handled editorially and are not subject to external scholarly peer review.

## Purpose of Peer Review

The purpose of peer review is to enhance the quality of scholarly publications. The primary function of the peer review statement is to assist the publisher in determining whether the submitted manuscript is suitable for publication. The peer review statement is also provided to the authors. A peer review statement is most valuable when it identifies concrete strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript and presents clearly justified suggestions for improvement.

## Who Can Act as a Peer Reviewer?

The reviewer must have expertise in the scholarly field relevant to the manuscript. In the case of multidisciplinary work, it may be necessary to assess the accuracy and adequacy of the manuscript's content through reviewers representing the relevant

fields addressed by the manuscript or its individual sections. Reviewers must be independent of the manuscript, its authors, and any work directly related to the manuscript under review. Reviewers should normally hold a doctoral degree or have equivalent scholarly expertise.

A reviewer must not have a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript or its author, nor may the reviewer be involved in the preparation of the manuscript. A close family relationship, supervisory relationship, or subordinate relationship constitutes grounds for disqualification. In such cases, the reviewer should decline the assignment. The review process is anonymous with respect to the reviewer's identity. Reviewers must decline the assignment if they consider that they cannot provide an impartial assessment.

## What Is Assessed in Peer Review?

The peer review process assesses the scope and adequacy of the manuscript's content, the command of the theoretical framework, the reliability and accuracy of the research design and implementation, and the originality and novelty value of the findings in relation to previous research, in accordance with the conventions of the relevant field.

The reviewer should consider the approach, methodology, and scholarly orientation of the manuscript and align the assessment accordingly, while recognising that different writing styles and multiple scholarly voices are part of research. Reviewers are asked to identify merits, shortcomings, and possible errors. The aim of the review is to provide concrete and well-founded suggestions for improving the manuscript.

## Guiding Questions for the Review

### 1. Introduction and Title

- Does the title attract interest and connect with the topic addressed?
- Does the introduction link the study to current or otherwise central themes in home economics and home economics education?
- Are the need for and aims of the study clearly justified in relation to home economics and/or home economics education?
- Are the research question, data, and methods presented clearly and with sufficient precision?
- Does the manuscript fulfil the expectations and aims set out in the introduction?

### 2. Theoretical Framework

- Is the theoretical framework relevant from the perspective of home economics and/or education?
- Are the theoretical premises presented clearly and understandably?

- Are the theoretical premises discussed in a scholarly and critically engaged manner in relation to the sources?
- Do the theoretical premises form a coherent whole?

### 3. Methodology: Data, Analysis, and Reporting of Findings

- Is the chosen methodology relevant from the perspective of home economics and/or home economics education?
- Do the research questions connect with the chosen methodology?
- Are the methods and data described with sufficient precision?
- Is the analysis described and presented clearly, while respecting responsible conduct of research?
- Are the findings reported clearly, sufficiently, and in a manner appropriate to the chosen methodology?
- Do the findings follow from the research task, that is, do they answer the research questions posed?

### 4. Conclusions and Discussion

- Do the findings support the conclusions drawn?
- Are the findings related to previous research literature?
- What is the originality and novelty value of the conclusions derived from the findings in relation to home economics and/or home economics education?
- Does the manuscript discuss the significance and applicability of the study and its findings in relation to home economics and/or home economics education?

### 5. Structure and Language

- Does the manuscript form a balanced, well-grounded, and coherent whole in terms of structure?
- Is the structure of the manuscript functional and proportionate?
- Is the language fluent, accurate, and stylistically appropriate, while allowing for the author's individual scholarly voice?

### 6. Tables, Figures, and Visual Presentation

- What is the relationship between any illustrations and the text?
- Are the images, figures, and tables informative and necessary?
- Do the visual elements support the manuscript as a whole?

### 7. Ethics and Suitability for Publication

- Does the author follow responsible and ethically sustainable research practices?
- Does the manuscript address key aspects affecting the reliability of the study and critically examine the chosen method and implementation?
- Has plagiarism or inadequate referencing been avoided?
- Does the manuscript overlap with previously published material?

- Is the manuscript suitable for publication in Home Economics Annual Yearbook?

## Overall Recommendation

In addition, reviewers are asked to indicate whether the manuscript is:

- publishable as it stands;
- acceptable for publication with minor or major revisions; or
- not recommended for publication.

## Principles to Observe in the Review

By agreeing to act as a reviewer, the expert confirms that they understand and commit to the following principles:

- The manuscript under review is confidential material.
- The manuscript must not be discussed with or shown to outsiders.
- The content of an unpublished manuscript must not be used for personal benefit.
- The manuscript and related material are protected by copyright.
- Reviewers must not upload the manuscript, any part of it, or related unpublished material to external artificial intelligence systems or other third-party digital services. The use of such systems must not compromise confidentiality, authorship, or the reviewer's independent scholarly judgement.

The purpose of the review is to support the author in improving the manuscript through concrete and well-justified suggestions. Accordingly, the review should be constructive, respectful, and academically rigorous. Reviewers should recognise that authors may employ different styles and that multiple scholarly voices are part of research. At the same time, reviewers should not refrain from presenting justified constructive criticism, as issues left unaddressed before publication may later become more difficult for the author to address.

The peer review statement should be addressed to the editorial board and written in a form that can be forwarded to the authors after the removal of identifying information.

The peer review statement must identify any overlap between the manuscript and previously published material, as well as any suspected plagiarism or shortcomings in referencing and source attribution. No fee is paid for the peer review statement; however, serving as a reviewer constitutes a scholarly merit.

## The Role of the Peer Review Statement in the Publication Process

Peer review statements are provided to the authors so that they may revise and strengthen the manuscript on the basis of the reviewers' assessments. Authors are

asked to submit a response to the peer review statements. This response supports the evaluation of the authors' readiness to revise the manuscript, the systematic nature of the revision process, and the extent to which the feedback provided in the peer review statements has been adequately addressed.

All references to the reviewer's identity are removed from the peer review statements before they are forwarded. The peer review statements and the authors' response are considered by the publisher's editorial board, which decides on this basis whether the publication process will continue or whether the manuscript will be returned to the authors without proceeding to publication.