The double-blind peer review process is of paramount importance to JRMA, and that process functions only when all parties act in a collaborative spirit of good faith and mutual respect. JRMA adheres to the Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers set forth by the Committee on Publication Ethics, and uses the following model: the process is double blind; the editor mediates all interactions between reviewers and authors; peer reviews are not published; peer review is facilitated by the journal; and the review is owned by the author of the peer review.

The JRMA Editorial Board expects all parties to follow the guidelines below regarding confidentiality, which are in keeping with recommendations for best practices from the Association of University Presses and shared by our sister societies.

Peer reviewers will

- Treat article manuscripts and all communications with JAMS related to peer review work as strictly confidential. This includes refraining from commenting on the manuscript on social media and in conversations with colleagues, publishing or circulating any part of an unpublished manuscript, or making use of original research without permission;
- Disclose potential conflicts of interest;
- Commit to remaining unbiased in their assessments;
- Provide professional critique in a constructive manner.

A peer reviewer may choose to reveal their identity.

Authors of article submissions will

- Treat peer reviews as confidential correspondence. Although it is common practice for an author to consult with a colleague or mentor about responding to peer reviews, the content of reviews should not be circulated or published, including on social media, unless an author receives permission from the peer reviewer, through the editor.

The editor and Editorial Board must

- Hold reviews in confidence. The editor may consult with members of the Editorial Board, and those members are bound to hold those consultations in the same confidence.

The editor reserves the right to edit peer reviews for tone, clarity, and concision, and for the protection of the reviewer's anonymity.