



ResearchBridge Africa

PEER REVIEWER INVITATION AND AGREEMENT PACK

Independent Judgement • Confidentiality • Developmental Review • Scholarly Quality

Purpose To invite qualified experts into a verified reviewer community and establish the ethical, confidential and assignment-specific terms governing peer review.

From Research Idea to Published Impact

Master Template | July 2026 | Ghana

1. Formal Invitation to Join the Peer Reviewer Community

[Date]

[Name of Prospective Reviewer]

[Academic/Professional Title]

[Department and Institution]

[Postal or Email Address]

Dear [Title and Surname],

INVITATION TO SERVE AS A PEER REVIEWER FOR RESEARCHBRIDGE AFRICA

ResearchBridge Africa respectfully invites you to apply to join its verified peer reviewer community and to contribute independent scholarly assessment within your areas of expertise.

The platform guides students and emerging researchers from topic development through learning, ethical research support, manuscript submission, peer review, revision, publication and dissemination. Reviewers protect scholarly quality while providing constructive feedback that helps authors improve.

Joining the reviewer pool does not oblige you to accept every manuscript and does not itself create a paid appointment. Each assignment must be separately offered and accepted, with its manuscript information, review model, deadline, expected report, confidentiality status and recognition or payment terms stated in advance.

Reviewer identity and confidential reports are accessible only within the authorised editorial workflow. Reviewers must remain impartial, declare conflicts of interest, protect submitted material, avoid unauthorised use of generative AI or external tools, and submit an original review based on their own expert judgement.

If you wish to participate, kindly complete the application, agreement and declarations in this pack. Appointment is subject to verification, approval, orientation and continued compliance with ResearchBridge Africa's reviewer standards.

Yours faithfully,

Alexander Amoah, PhD

Project Lead, ResearchBridge Africa

Website: researchbridge-africa.xanderamoah.chatgpt.site

2. Reviewer Membership Overview

Core principle Peer review combines rigorous quality control with respectful, developmental feedback. Reviewers advise; authorised editors make decisions.

2.1 Purpose

- Provide independent, expert assessment of the originality, relevance, rigour and presentation of submitted work.
- Help authors identify strengths, correct weaknesses and improve publication readiness.
- Protect academic integrity, ethical research practice and the credibility of the platform's publication workflow.
- Build a diverse African and international reviewer community across disciplines, methods and professional fields.
- Support fair, timely and evidence-based editorial decisions without displacing editorial authority.

2.2 Eligibility

- A relevant postgraduate qualification, recognised research record or equivalent verified professional expertise.
- Demonstrated subject or methodological competence appropriate to prospective assignments.
- A verifiable institutional, professional or independent scholarly identity.
- Capacity to provide clear, constructive and timely written reviews.
- Acceptance of confidentiality, impartiality, conflict-of-interest, data-protection and academic-integrity requirements.

2.3 Verification and Appointment

Applicants may be asked for an institutional email, curriculum vitae, qualification evidence, staff or professional profile, ORCID or publication record. Reviewer status begins only after verification and written approval. It is personal, non-transferable and subject to periodic review.

2.4 Independence and Editorial Authority

A reviewer provides an advisory assessment. The reviewer does not guarantee acceptance, reject a manuscript personally, negotiate payment with the author, or communicate an editorial decision. ResearchBridge Africa retains responsibility for reviewer assignment, evaluation of reports and authorised decisions.

3. Reviewer Role and Assignment Lifecycle

Stage	Reviewer responsibility
Invitation	The platform supplies sufficient non-confidential or protected information to assess expertise, availability and possible conflicts.
Conflict check	The reviewer declares any actual, potential or perceived conflict before accessing the full manuscript.
Acceptance	The reviewer accepts the scope, review model, deadline, expected report and participation terms.
Assessment	The reviewer examines the manuscript independently and securely against the stated criteria.
Report	The reviewer submits a constructive report and an editorial recommendation through the authorised channel.
Clarification	The editor may request limited clarification; substantive extra work requires an agreed extension or new assignment.
Closure	Access ends when the assignment closes; retained copies and confidential notes are securely deleted unless authorised retention applies.

3.1 Right to Accept or Decline

A reviewer may decline an invitation because of expertise, workload, timing, conflict, accessibility or any other legitimate reason. Declining promptly is preferable to accepting an assignment that cannot be completed well or on time.

3.2 Timeliness and Communication

- Acknowledge or decline an invitation within the stated response period.
- Notify the editor promptly if a delay, conflict or inability to complete becomes apparent.
- Do not contact the author directly unless the editorial process expressly authorises it.
- Submit all reports and confidential notes through the designated platform route.

Assignment boundary The reviewer receives only role-appropriate access and must not use the manuscript, data, ideas or author identity for personal, competitive, teaching, publication or commercial purposes.

4. Reviewer Benefits, Recognition and Participation Status

4.1 Potential Benefits

- Contribution to credible African scholarship and the development of emerging researchers.
- A verified reviewer profile displaying approved expertise, subject to privacy choices.
- Reviewer activity records, acknowledgements or certificates where applicable.
- Opportunities for interdisciplinary, institutional and professional collaboration.
- Eligibility for editorial development, reviewer training and advanced roles based on performance.
- Eligibility for a separately approved honorarium or paid assignment where funding and written terms exist.

4.2 Participation Status

Status	Meaning
Voluntary	No fee is payable; the expected scope and time commitment are disclosed before acceptance.
Recognised	The completed review may receive a verified record, acknowledgement or certificate, but no fee unless separately stated.
Honorarium/Paid	A written assignment states the amount, basis, completion standard, payment conditions and applicable deductions.

4.3 What Appointment Does Not Create

- Employment, agency, partnership, guaranteed income or a minimum number of assignments.
- Authority to represent ResearchBridge Africa or a participating institution without express approval.
- A right to access all manuscripts, reviewer identities, author records, payments or editorial information.
- A right to use the platform's name or an author's work for advertising, solicitation or private services.
- A promise that the reviewer's recommendation will be adopted as the final decision.

4.4 Recognition Conditions

Recognition is based on verified completion and may be withheld or corrected where a report is late, superficial, plagiarised, fabricated, delegated, conflicted, generated without adequate expert review, or otherwise inconsistent with this agreement.

5. Peer Reviewer Code of Ethics

Every approved reviewer agrees to the following standards:

1. **Competence.** Accept only work reasonably within your verified expertise and ability.
2. **Impartiality.** Assess the work fairly, without discrimination, favouritism, personal hostility or improper influence.
3. **Confidentiality.** Treat the invitation, manuscript, data, identities, reports and editorial communications as confidential.
4. **Original judgement.** Submit your own expert assessment; do not delegate the review or present unverified tool output as professional judgement.
5. **Constructive criticism.** Explain material concerns clearly and respectfully, distinguishing required corrections from optional suggestions.
6. **Evidence and relevance.** Base comments on the manuscript and appropriate scholarly standards; avoid unsupported demands or irrelevant self-citation.
7. **Integrity.** Report suspected plagiarism, fabrication, ethical problems or manipulation through the confidential editorial channel.
8. **Timeliness.** Meet the accepted deadline or notify the editor early enough for reassignment or extension.
9. **No exploitation.** Do not use access to solicit authors, obtain private work, appropriate ideas or seek personal advantage.
10. **Respectful language.** Do not include insults, threats, discriminatory remarks or comments about an author's identity or presumed ability.
11. **Secure access.** Protect credentials, devices, downloads and confidential notes, and report suspected compromise promptly.
12. **Compliance.** Follow applicable law, institutional obligations, platform policies and assignment-specific instructions.

5.1 Prohibited Conduct

- Sharing the manuscript or allowing another person to review under your identity.
- Using unpublished ideas, methods, findings, data or citations before they become lawfully public.
- Requesting citations primarily to inflate your own or an associate's metrics.
- Accepting money, gifts or private benefits from an author in connection with an assignment.
- Promising acceptance, negotiating editorial outcomes or retaliating against an author or editor.

6. Confidentiality, Conflicts, Data and Tool Use Agreement

6.1 Confidential Information

Confidential information includes the invitation, manuscript and supplementary files; unpublished ideas, methods, data and findings; author and reviewer identities where protected; editorial correspondence, recommendations and decisions; platform records; and any information marked confidential or reasonably understood to be private.

6.2 Reviewer Undertakings

- Use confidential information only to complete the accepted assignment.
- Do not copy, distribute, quote, teach from, publish, exploit or disclose submitted material except as authorised.
- Keep access credentials private and use reasonable security for devices, files and notes.
- Download only when necessary and authorised; remove retained copies when the assignment closes or when instructed.
- Notify ResearchBridge Africa promptly of accidental disclosure, lost access, suspicious activity or another confidentiality incident.
- Continue to observe confidentiality after the review, reviewer membership or this agreement ends.

6.3 Conflict of Interest

A reviewer must disclose any actual, potential or perceived conflict before accepting or continuing an assignment. The editor decides whether the conflict requires reassignment, anonymisation, restricted participation or another managed response.

Examples Recent collaboration, supervision or assessment; close personal relationship; financial interest; direct competition; institutional dispute; prior involvement in the manuscript; strong public position that prevents fair assessment; or any circumstance a reasonable person may believe could affect impartiality.

6.4 Generative AI and External Tools

- Do not upload or paste a confidential manuscript, extract, dataset or identifying information into a public or third-party AI system, translation service, plagiarism checker or other external tool without explicit written authorisation.
- Where a permitted tool is used, minimise the data disclosed, verify every output, disclose material assistance as required and remain personally accountable for the complete review.
- Automated text must not replace close reading, disciplinary expertise, methodological judgement or an original reviewer report.
- A tool must not be used to infer protected personal characteristics, deanonymise participants or reviewers, or repurpose confidential research.

6.5 Breach and Corrective Action

A suspected breach may lead to access restriction, reassignment, investigation, correction of records, withholding of recognition or payment, suspension or termination. Serious matters may be referred to an authorised institution or competent body, subject to fair process, applicable law and necessary protection of confidential information.

7. Review Standards and Reporting Guidance

Criterion	Guiding question
Scope and relevance	Is the problem clear, researchable and significant for the intended field or audience?
Originality and contribution	What does the work add, clarify, test, apply or challenge?
Literature and framework	Is relevant scholarship used accurately, critically and coherently?
Methodology	Are design, sampling, data collection, measurement, analysis and limitations appropriate and transparent?
Ethics and integrity	Are consent, approvals, confidentiality, reporting and attribution handled responsibly?
Results and analysis	Are findings accurate, sufficiently supported and clearly distinguished from interpretation?
Discussion and conclusion	Do claims follow from the evidence, engage the literature and avoid overstatement?
Presentation	Is the structure readable, terminology consistent, referencing adequate and language professionally clear?

7.1 Recommended Report Structure

1. Brief overall assessment and principal contribution.
2. Major comments: issues affecting validity, ethics, interpretation, contribution or publication readiness.
3. Minor comments: clarity, presentation, consistency, referencing and correctable details.
4. Confidential comments to the editor, only where necessary and not used to contradict the author-facing report unfairly.
5. A recommendation selected from the assignment's decision scale.

7.2 Recommendation Scale

Use the scale stated in the assignment. The standard options are: Accept; Minor Revision; Major Revision; Resubmit for New Review; Reject; or Outside My Expertise/Unable to Complete. A recommendation must be supported by the report and remains advisory.

8. Reviewer Membership Application and Expertise Profile

Please complete legibly. Attach a curriculum vitae or professional profile where requested.

Full name and title	
Preferred display name	
Institution/organisation	
Department/unit	
Current position	
Highest qualification	
Discipline/field	
Country and city	
Verified institutional email	
Alternative email	
Telephone/WhatsApp	
ORCID/researcher/staff-profile link	

8.1 Verification Documents

☐ Curriculum vitae ☐ Qualification evidence ☐ Institutional profile
☐ ORCID/publication profile ☐ Identity evidence if requested ☐ Other: _____

8.2 Subject and Regional Expertise

8.3 Methodological Expertise

☐ Qualitative ☐ Quantitative ☐ Mixed methods ☐ Case study
☐ Survey design ☐ Interviews/FGDs ☐ Document analysis ☐ Observation
☐ Statistics/SPSS ☐ Thematic analysis ☐ Policy analysis ☐ Other: _____

9. Review Preferences and Standing Agreement

9.1 Preferred Manuscript Types

☐ Undergraduate project	☐ Postgraduate thesis extract	☐ Journal article
☐ Policy/research brief		
☐ Book chapter		
☐ Other: _____		

9.2 Review Model and Availability

Review model preference	☐ Double-anonymous ☐ Single-anonymous ☐ Open where agreed
Approximate reviews per year	
Typical review period	☐ 7 days ☐ 14 days ☐ 21 days ☐ Other: _____
Participation preference	☐ Voluntary ☐ Recognised ☐ Honorarium/Paid where available
Unavailable periods	

9.3 Standing Declarations

1. The information and evidence I provide are accurate and may be verified.
2. I have read and accept this Peer Reviewer Invitation and Agreement Pack.
3. I will accept only assignments within my competence, capacity and authorised role.
4. I will protect confidential information and will not delegate an assigned review.
5. I will disclose conflicts of interest promptly and comply with the editorial decision on management or reassignment.
6. I will submit an original, evidence-based and respectful review through the authorised channel.
7. I will not upload confidential material to external AI or other tools without explicit written authorisation.
8. I understand that appointment is not employment and does not guarantee assignments or fees; I authorise display of my approved professional profile subject to my privacy choices.
9. I will report any material change in my affiliation, expertise, availability or ability to comply.

9.4 Applicant Acceptance

Full name	Signature
Date	Place

10. Manuscript-Specific Assignment Acceptance

Complete for each assignment Standing membership does not replace this manuscript-specific acceptance and conflict check.

Reviewer name/ID	
Manuscript ID	
Manuscript title or protected summary	
Discipline/method	
Review model	☐ Double-anonymous ☐ Single-anonymous ☐ Open
Date invited	
Response due	
Review due	
Participation status	☐ Voluntary ☐ Recognised ☐ Honorarium/Paid
Agreed amount/terms, if applicable	

10.1 Expertise and Conflict Check

I have sufficient expertise to review this work.	☐ Yes ☐ Partly—clarification needed ☐ No
I can meet the stated deadline.	☐ Yes ☐ Extension requested ☐ No
I know the author's identity.	☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Uncertain
I have an actual, potential or perceived conflict.	☐ No ☐ Yes—details below
I require accessibility or technical support.	☐ No ☐ Yes—details below

10.2 Conflict or Clarification Details

10.2.1 Reviewer Explanation

Describe the conflict, prior relationship, expertise limitation, requested clarification, support need or revised deadline:

10.2.2 Editorial Response or Conditions

Record any reassignment, anonymisation, restriction, extension, support arrangement or other decision:

10.3 Assignment Decision

☐ Accept ☐ Decline ☐ Request clarification ☐ Request revised deadline

Reviewer signature/confirmation	Date
Editorial acknowledgement	Date

11. Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript ID	
Reviewer ID/name, as authorised	
Date assigned	
Date submitted	

11.1 Overall Assessment and Contribution

11.2 Major Comments

11.3 Minor Comments

11.4 Confidential Comments to the Editor

Use only where necessary. Do not include an undisclosed adverse argument that the author has no fair opportunity to address.

11.5 Recommendation

☐ Accept ☐ Minor Revision ☐ Major Revision

☐ Resubmit for New Review ☐ Reject ☐ Outside My Expertise/Unable to Complete

Reviewer confirmation: I confirm that this report is my original professional assessment and complies with the accepted assignment and reviewer agreement.

12. Reviewer Approval, Onboarding and Agreement Administration

12.1 For ResearchBridge Africa Use

Application received	
Identity/qualification checked	☐ Complete ☐ Pending ☐ Not required
Affiliation/profile checked	☐ Verified ☐ Independent profile verified ☐ Pending
Expertise review	☐ Suitable ☐ Clarification required ☐ Not approved
Reviewer decision	☐ Approved ☐ Conditionally approved ☐ Declined
Approved disciplines/methods	
Review model authorised	
Membership review date	
Authorised officer/name/date	

12.2 Onboarding Checklist

- ☐ Reviewer approval communicated.
- ☐ Profile details and visibility choices confirmed.
- ☐ Confidentiality, conflict and reviewer-independence standards explained.
- ☐ Secure platform access and account protection completed.
- ☐ Assignment acceptance and reviewer-report workflow demonstrated.
- ☐ Generative AI and external-tool restrictions explained.
- ☐ Recognition, certification or payment rules clarified.
- ☐ Availability and notification preferences recorded.
- ☐ Pilot or first assignment agreed, where applicable.

12.3 Term, Review, Suspension and Exit

This standing agreement takes effect when approved and remains in force until ended by the reviewer or ResearchBridge Africa. Reviewer status may be paused, reviewed or terminated for inactivity, loss of verification, repeated delay, inadequate reports, unsafe access, conflict non-disclosure or misconduct. Confidentiality, non-use of submitted material, data-security and other provisions intended to survive continue after exit.

12.4 Changes and Priority of Assignment Terms

ResearchBridge Africa may update reviewer policies with reasonable notice. A manuscript-specific assignment may add stricter confidentiality, deadline, ethics or payment terms. If a material conflict arises, the more protective applicable term governs unless an authorised written variation states otherwise.

12.5 Administrative Agreement Confirmation

Approval below confirms reviewer appointment under this standing agreement. It does not itself accept a manuscript assignment or promise remuneration.

Approved reviewer name/ID	Effective date
Authorised officer	Signature/confirmation
Next review date	Administrative notes

Document status This master pack combines invitation, standing reviewer agreement, application and operational forms. It does not create employment, replace institutional obligations or by itself promise a paid assignment.

RESEARCHBRIDGE AFRICA

Learn. Develop. Review. Publish. Impact.

researchbridge-africa.xanderamoah.chatgpt.site