Guidelines for Reviewers

(Updated August 2024)

Thank you very much for your support of the CAET journal by serving as a peer reviewer of manuscripts. Please read carefully the following guidelines before you start the review process.

- Invitation to Review- Potential Conflicts of Interests- Confidentiality and Anonymity- Timely Review- Rating the Manuscript- Overall Recommendation- Review Report- Editing of Review Reports- Volunteer to be a Reviewer for CAET?

Invitation to ReviewManuscripts submitted to CAET are pre-reviewed by the Editorial Office first according to the basic requirements of CAET regarding the format, word count, English level and match to the [Aims and Scope](https://caet.inspirees.com/aims-and-scope/) of the journal. If a manuscript is being considered for peer review, at least two experts are asked to evaluate the quality of the manuscript and to provide a recommendation to the Editorial Office on whether it should be accepted, requires revisions or should be rejected.

We strongly suggest that all our reviewers and authors to be familiar with the unique style of CAET by reading some of the articles published in the journal which are all available by open access at <https://caet.inspirees.com/caetojsjournals/index.php/caet/issue/archive>.

We are asking reviewers to:

* Accept or decline an invitation to review an article based on the manuscript title and abstract;
* Suggest alternative reviewers if an invitation is declined;
* Reviewers are generally given 2 weeks to complete the review and can request an extension in case more time is required to finish the review.

As part of the assessment, we ask reviewers to:

* Rate the originality, significance, quality of the presentation, scientific soundness, interest to the readers, overall merit and English level of the manuscript;
* Provide an overall recommendation for the publication of the manuscript;
* Fill in a constructive review report with the form we provide.

Potential Conflicts of InterestsIf the reviewers find that there is a conflict of interests that may prejudice the review report, either in a positive or negative way, please inform the Editorial Office. We will check as far as possible before invitation; however, we appreciate the cooperation of reviewers in this matter.  
Reviewers who are invited to assess a manuscript that they previously reviewed for another journal should not consider this as a conflict of interest in itself. In this case, reviewers should feel free to let us know if the manuscript has been improved or not compared to the previous version.

Confidentiality and AnonymityReviewers should keep the content of the manuscript, including the abstract, confidential. We expect that if you accept this invitation to review an article that you will personally conduct the review. We operate a double-blind peer review process. Reviewers should be careful not to reveal their identity to the authors, either in their comments or in metadata for reports submitted in Microsoft Word or PDF format.

Timely ReviewCAET aims to provide an efficient and high-quality publishing service to authors and to the scientific community. We ask reviewers to assist by providing review reports in a timely manner. Please contact the editorial office if you require an extension to the review deadline.

Rating the ManuscriptPlease rate the following aspects of the manuscript:

* Consistency and clarity: Does the paper serve well the [Aims and Scope](https://caet.inspirees.com/aims-and-scope/) of the journal, and enhance the global dialogue from east and west perspectives? Do the title and abstract reflect the content of the article adequately? Is the article clearly written and well organized?
* Interest to the Readers: Are the conclusions interesting for the readership of the Journal? Will the paper attract a wide readership, or be of interest only to a limited number of people? Is the language clear and jargon-free? Would it be accessible for someone from a different discipline?
* Originality/Novelty: Is the topic under consideration original and well defined? Does the article provide an advance in current knowledge? Does the paper give the unique perspectives of the author or borrow too many opinions from other scholars?
* Significance: Is the significance of this article explained relative to the existing literature?
* Quality of Presentation: Is the article written in an appropriate way? Is the article presented appropriately in a convincing and logical way?
* Scientific Soundness (if appropriate): is the study correctly designed and technically sound? Are the analyses performed with the highest standards? Is the data robust enough to draw conclusions? Are the methods, tools, and software described with sufficient details
* *Reference*: does the article list enough references from reliable and recognized sources, and are the citations referenced in line with the format (APA) required by CAET.
* Overall Merit: Is there an overall benefit to publishing this work? Does the work provide an advance towards or beyond current knowledge
* English Level: Is the English language appropriate and understandable? Does the article need to be proofread by a native English speaker? Manuscripts submitted to CAET should meet the highest standards of publication
* *Ethics*: Manuscripts should not have been submitted or published before, even in part. Manuscripts must be original and should not reuse text from another source without appropriate citation. If reviewers find such scientific misconduct or fraud, plagiarism or any other unethical behavior related to the manuscript, they should raise these concerns to the Editorial Office immediately.

Overall RecommendationPlease provide an overall recommendation for the publication of the manuscript as follows:

* Accept in present form  
  The manuscript makes a significant and unique contribution to current knowledge, is clearly presented, and describes the methodology with sufficient details to be verifiable.
* Minor revisions  
  The manuscript could be acceptable for publication but would either benefit from specific changes to improve overall quality or from corrections to minor errors (that do not change the conclusions of the paper). Reviewers may request that the revised manuscripts are sent to them for another review.
* Major revisions  
  There is some merit in the article, but it fails to meet all the requirements for publication. Reviewers should clearly and specifically mention areas for improvement and, if possible, provide references to substantiate the comments made. A revised version of the article will usually be sent to the reviewer for further comment.
* Reject  
  The article has serious flaws, makes no original contribution, or the amount of work required to make it publishable could not be completed in a reasonable amount of time.

Review ReportPlease use the Review Report Form we provide to fill in your feedback. Ideally, review report should address the following aspects:

* A brief summary outlining the aim of the paper and its main contributions.
* Broad comments highlighting areas of strength and weakness. These comments  
  should be specific enough for authors to be able to respond.
* Specific comments referring to line numbers, tables or figures. Reviewers need  
  not comment on formatting issues that do not obscure the meaning of the  
  paper, as these will be addressed by editors.

For further guidance about writing a critical review, please refer to the following  
documents:

* COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. Committee on Publication  
  Ethics. [Available online](http://publicationethics.org/files/u7140/Peer%20review%20guidelines.pdf).
* Hames, I. Peer Review and Manuscript Management in Scientific Journals:  
  Guidelines for Good Practice. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford, UK, 2007. [Available online](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270669931_Peer_Review_and_Manuscript_Management_in_Scientific_Journals_Guidelines_for_Good_Practice).
* Golash-Boza, T. How to write a peer review for an academic journal: Six steps  
  from start to finish. [Available online](http://www.phd2published.com/2012/05/09/how-to-write-a-peer-review-for-an-academic-journal-six-steps-from-start-to-finish-by-tanya-golash-boza/).

Editing of Review Reports

CAET editors never edit reviewer comments intended for the authors. Reviewers are  
thus asked to make fair comments and to use appropriate language. Confidential  
comments to the editors can be made in a dedicated box on the review form.

Volunteer to be a Reviewer for CAET?If you are interested in reviewing CAET articles, please contact our editorial office by email caet.journal@inspirees.com including your ORCID identifier, institutional affiliation, a short CV, and 5-6 keywords in line with your expertise. We will send you a notification once approved.

Thank you for your cooperation!  
CAET Editorial Office  
[caet.journal@inspirees.com](mailto:caet.journal@inspirees.com)

[**CAET Aims and Scope**](https://caet.inspirees.com/aims-and-scope/)*Creative Arts in Education and Therapy* (*CAET*) – Eastern, Western & Global Perspectives is an international journal for artists, educators and therapists, who use and integrate the creative arts in their work. The focus is on reporting and discussing perspectives, presenting art-based applications between the West and the East – particularly China and its neighboring cultures.  The journal supports cross-disciplinary dialogue, cooperation and research between the creative arts (creative writing, dance/movement, drama, film, music, and the visual arts) and education, therapy, psychology, medicine, and other related fields. The journal also welcomes contributions that advance these artistic applications and purposes in all parts of the world.

*CAET*invites research articles, artistic expressions, case reports, program descriptions, position papers, interviews, and conference reports relevant to the field. We also welcome books for review consideration. Book reviews are by invitation only and the editorial office will determine these invitations. Manuscripts are subject to a peer review process before being accepted and published. Contributions are to be in English and will be published with bilingual abstracts: English and Chinese. *CAET* publishes 2 issues per year in both print and online versions.

CAET portal <https://caet.inspirees.com/>

CAET article archive <https://caet.inspirees.com/caetojsjournals/index.php/caet/issue/archive>