

# GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

## General Policies and Procedures

Authors submit their manuscripts electronically via emails to the Corresponding Editor. Each manuscript is reviewed by internal reviewers for relevancy to the individual journal, and notified to the authors in the abstract review form for further action.

If any issues, the Corresponding Editor will contact the Editor in Chief (or an appropriate Editor), who will decide whether the manuscript should be transferred to another journal published by us, editorially rejected owing to scope, or retained for review by the journal to which it was submitted. If retained, the manuscript is assigned to an editor, who in turn chooses one or more editorial board members or reviewers to review it.

### On receipt of the invitation to review,

- Please read the editor's e-mail, to determine whether the subject is within your area of expertise and whether you can complete the review in the stated time period.
- Accept or decline the invitation to review.

### If you decline the invitation to review:

- Indicate why you are declining.
- If possible, please suggest a colleague who may be able to review the manuscript. If appropriate, the editor will send an invitation to review to that individual. You may not "transfer" your invitation to review the manuscript to a colleague.

### If you accept the invitation to review, you will have access to the complete manuscript and should immediately:

- See whether there is any conflict of interest and whether you can judge the article impartially.
- See through the relevant portions of the manuscript and verify that it fits within the scope of the journal.

If you have either a time problem or a conflict of interest, contact the editor for instructions regarding extending your deadline or canceling the review assignment as appropriate. If your examination reveals that the manuscript does not fit within the scope of the journal, indicate that in the review form.

The manuscript provided to you for review is a privileged document. Please protect it from any form of exploitation.

## The Review

Positive, impartial, but critical attitude toward the manuscript under review is appreciated.

### Please consider the following aspects when reviewing a manuscript:

- Significance to the target scientific community
- Originality
- Appropriateness of the approach or experimental design
- Appropriateness of the statistical analyses
- Appropriate literature citations
- Adequacy of experimental techniques
- Soundness of conclusions and interpretation
- Relevance of discussion
- Organization
- Adherence to the Instructions to Authors
- Adequacy of title and abstract
- Appropriateness of figures and tables
- Appropriateness of supplemental material
- Length prescribed

# GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Some of the items for which you should be alert include:

- **Plagiarism:** Plagiarism is not limited to the Results and Discussion sections; it can involve any part of the manuscript, including figures and tables, in which material is copied from another publication without attestation, reference, or permission.
- **Missing or incomplete attestation:** Authors must give appropriate credit to ideas, concepts, and data that have been published previously. This is accomplished by the inclusion of references. Missing, incomplete, or incorrect references must be brought to the editor's attention.
- **Dual submission and/or publication:** Be wary of attempts to submit/publish similar material more than once. This is often difficult to detect "before the fact," but checking literature citations, as well as having a critical eye, is helpful.

**Your criticisms, arguments, and suggestions** concerning the paper will be most useful to the editor and to the author if they are carefully documented. Dogmatic, dismissive statements, particularly about the novelty of the work are to be avoided. Substantiate your statements. You will be asked to suggest acceptability as noted on the specific review form.

**In your comments intended for the author**, organize your review so that an introductory paragraph summarizes the major findings of the article, gives your overall impression of the paper, and highlights the major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments, which, if appropriate, may be subdivided into major and minor points (See review form attached).

- Very few papers qualify for an immediate, unconditional acceptance.
- There are many reasons to reject a paper. In general, if there are serious flaws in experimental design, incorrect interpretation of data, extensive additional experiments required, or any organizational or English usage flaws that prevent critical review of the manuscript, then recommend that the manuscript be rejected.
- If you feel that the deficiencies can be corrected within a reasonable period of time, then recommend modification (e.g., accept with revision; or re-review required, if the revisions are extensive).

Advise the editor of your recommendation for acceptance, modification, or rejection of the manuscript. Reviewer's recommendations are gratefully received by the editor; however, since editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editor to honor every recommendation. The final decision regarding modification, acceptance, or rejection of a manuscript rests solely with the editor.