

Editorial office:

Juliane Falk
Kiesselbachweg 31
D-22399 Hamburg
Tel.: 040/5 00 99 453
E-Mail: Pflege-und-Gesellschaft@t-online.de

Editorial board:

Prof. Dr Andreas Büscher, Dr Christine Dunger,
Juliane Falk, Prof. Dr Ulrike Höhmann, Prof. Dr
Inge Eberl, Prof. Dr Annett Horn, Prof. Dr
Manfred Hülsken-Giesler, Prof. Dr Julia
Lademann, Prof. Dr Andrea Schiff, Prof. Dr
Stefan Schmidt, Prof. Dr Renate Stemmer

Guidelines for reviewers of manuscripts

Introduction

The following handout is a guideline for the review of manuscripts and is based on the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) [<LINK Welcome to COPE>](#). The aim is to present the criteria that should be assessed. For the comprehensibility and transparency of your assessment, it is important that your comments contain clear, comprehensible reasons and are formulated objectively and appreciatively. (The editors reserve the right to delete irrelevant and/or personal comments).

The editorial board of *Pflege & Gesellschaft* sees the review process as a collegial consultation in which suggestions and justifications should always be formulated in such a way that the authors can continue to work with them, even if a negative assessment is reached. Reviews are professional and factual and do not contain any personal criticism. In this context, we ask you to refer to the relevant Reporting Guidelines and/or Critical Appraisal Tools ([Reporting guidelines | EQUATOR Network \(equator-network.org\)](#)/ [Critical Appraisal tools, e.g. Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine \(CEBM\), University of Oxford](#)).

Pflege & Gesellschaft accepts various types of original articles such as empirical studies, literature analyses/literature reviews, theoretical analyses and essays. Reporting Guidelines and/or Critical Appraisal Tools are not available for all of these types of article. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

In addition to a general checklist and some questions on publication and research ethics, this handout contains a declaration of bias and confidentiality, which must be signed and returned. This declaration will not be forwarded to the authors. The entire review process is double-blinded, i.e. both authors and reviewers remain anonymous.

If you use AI technology as part of the assessment to support the creation of the review, the editorial office of *Pflege & Gesellschaft* must be informed. Be aware that AI can produce results that give the appearance of accuracy, but may also be incorrect, incomplete or biased.

If you wish and after the review has been completed, you will be given access to the anonymised review by the second reviewer. Should the reviewers come to different judgements, the decision on publication lies with the managing editor.

You can refuse to accept a review. In this case, it would be very helpful if you could give us a reference to other potential reviewers. However, please do not pass on the manuscript yourself. If you accept the review, we would ask you to provide us with prompt feedback within the agreed time frame.

You are asked not to retain the manuscript for their personal use and to destroy paper copies of manuscripts and delete electronic copies after submitting their reviews.

Thank you for your support!

Last updated: 23-04-2025

General checklist

Please read all documents and contact the editors if they are not complete or if you have any questions. If you have any uncertainties during the review process, please also contact the editors and never share the documents with other people without consulting them.

You can use the following checklists for your assessment. You do not need to make any comments in the manuscript, but you should use the line numbers as a guide. In addition, use suitable Reporting Guidelines and/or Critical Appraisal Tools if these are available.

Criterion	Tend to be fulfilled	Tend not to be fulfilled	N.A.	Comment
Does the article fit the journal's orientation?				
Does the title match the content?				
Is the summary clearly structured and coherent in terms of content?				
Are the summary and keywords available in English?				
Are the topic and background up-to-date and well-founded?				
Has a clear question/aim been derived from the background?				
Are the theory and methods justified, comprehensibly described and suitable for achieving the scientific objective?				
Are the results comprehensibly described and clearly separated from the interpretation?				
Can the interpretation/discussion be derived from the results?				
Is the interpretation/discussion related to the theoretical framework/background?				
Are figures/tables clearly understandable?				
Is the bibliography complete and up-to-date?				
Is the length of the text justified?				

Are the language and style appropriate?				
---	--	--	--	--

Publication and research ethics checklist

Criterion	Yes	No	N.A.	Comment
Is an ethical vote described? <i>If yes: Is the application number given?</i>				
Are all authors named and their contribution to the study and the writing of the manuscript given?				
Is there a suspicion of plagiarism or double publication?				
Is a potential conflict of interest described?				
Are possible financial subsidies described?				

Additional notes and comments for the authors:

Overall judgement and reassessment

Acceptance without changes	
Acceptance with minor changes as indicated	
Acceptance with indicated major changes	
Rejection with the possibility of resubmission	
Rejection	

Would you like to re-evaluate the manuscript with the overall rating "Acceptance with major changes indicated" after a revision?

Yes No

Would you like to view the anonymised second review?

Yes No

Declaration

Please sign the paragraphs below. These and your signature are not part of the review that will be sent back to the authors.

As the reviewer of this manuscript, I hereby confirm that I have no bias or conflicts of interest. The authors are neither my colleagues nor members of a working group in which I am involved, nor am I in any way personally involved in the work presented here. I also confirm that until publication I will maintain confidentiality about the reviewed content.

Place, date

Signature