

Guidelines for Reviewers

- The unpublished manuscript is a privileged document. Please protect it from any form of exploitation. Reviewers are expected not to cite a manuscript or refer to the work it describes before it has been published, and to refrain from using the information it contains for the advancement of their own research.
- A reviewer should consciously adopt a positive, impartial attitude towards the manuscript under review. Your position should be that of the author's ally, with the aim of promoting effective and accurate scientific communication.
- If you believe that you cannot judge a given article impartially, please return the manuscript immediately to the editor with that explanation.
- Reviews should be completed expeditiously, within 1-2 weeks. If you know that you cannot finish the review within the time specified, please inform the editor.
- A reviewer should not discuss a paper with its author/s. If you want to consult a colleague or junior, please discuss this with us first.
- Please do not make any specific statement about acceptability of a paper in your comments for transmission to the author, but advise the editor in the space provided.

Writing Comments for Editors and Authors

- In comments intended for the authors, criticism should be presented dispassionately, and abrasive remarks avoided.
- Suggested revisions should be labeled as such, and not expressed as conditions of acceptance. Please distinguish between revisions considered essential (i.e., label as “Major concerns”) and those judged merely desirable (i.e., label as “Minor suggestions”).
- Even if we do not accept a paper, we would like to pass on constructive comments that might help the author to improve it. For this reason, please give detailed comments (with references, if appropriate) that will help both the editors to make a decision on the paper and the authors to improve it.
- Your criticism, arguments, and suggestions concerning that paper will be most useful to the editor if they are carefully documented.
- You are not requested to correct mistake/s in grammar, but any help in this regard will be appreciated.
- The editor gratefully receives a reviewer's recommendations, but since the editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources, a reviewer should not expect the editor to honor his or her every recommendation.
- The journal follows a double-blind review process, meaning that the authors and reviewers are blinded to each other. If it is necessary to attach a file with your review, please ensure that your identity is kept anonymous.

Additional information about the roles and responsibilities of peer reviewers is available from Council of Science Editors:

<https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-3-reviewer-roles-and-responsibilities/>

10 Questions to consider when reviewing a manuscript (note that some items may not apply to all article types)

1. Is the title informative, appropriate, and not misleading?
2. Does the abstract represent the most important content of all the main sections?
3. Does the introduction clearly justify and define the objectives (i.e., main question or hypothesis)?
4. Has the methodology been clearly described: study period, duration, type of study, population details, inclusion/exclusion criteria?
5. Are the details of consent and ethics clearance mentioned (if applicable)?
6. Are the data analysis methods described clearly and completely?
7. Do you believe the results are valid?
8. Is the discussion relevant and comprehensive?
9. Are the conclusions based on evidence presented in the manuscript?
10. Have the authors followed the appropriate reporting guidelines per journal instructions?

For more tips, please watch this video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K7OCmUH253E>