

## **Reviewer Instructions**

Most important decisions in science and academic are based on peer-reviewed publications. Peer review is the fundamental mechanism by which the quality of research is judged.

The quality of the peer-review process together with the quality of the editorial board are the primary factor which define a journal's reputation, impact factor, and position in the research community.

Scientific journals publishing peer-reviewed articles depend heavily on the scientific referees or reviewers who typically volunteer their time and expertise. In addition to fairness in judgment and expertise in the field, peer reviewers have significant responsibilities toward authors, editors, and readers.

### **Peer-reviewer responsibilities toward authors**

- Providing written, unbiased feedback in a timely manner on the scholarly merits and the scientific value of the work, together with the documented basis for the reviewer's opinion
- Indicating whether the writing is clear, concise, and relevant and rating the work's composition, scientific accuracy, originality, and interest to the journal's readers
- Avoiding personal comments or criticism
- Maintaining the confidentiality of the review process: not sharing, discussing with third parties, or disclosing information from the reviewed paper

### **Peer-reviewer responsibilities toward editors**

- Notifying the editor immediately if unable to review in a timely manner and providing the names of potential other reviewers
- Alerting the editor about any potential personal or financial conflict of interest and declining to review when a possibility of a conflict exists
- Complying with the editor's written instructions on the journal's expectations for the scope, content, and quality of the review
- Providing a thoughtful, fair, constructive, and informative critique of the submitted work, which may include supplementary material provided to the journal by the author
- Determining scientific merit, originality, and scope of the work; indicating ways to improve it; and recommending acceptance or rejection using whatever rating scale the editor deems most useful
- Noting any ethical concerns, such as any violation of accepted norms particularly at substantial similarity between the reviewed manuscript and any published paper or any manuscript concurrently submitted to another journal which may be known to the reviewer
- Refraining from direct author contact

### **Peer-reviewer responsibilities toward readers**

- Ensuring that the methods are adequately detailed to allow the reader to judge the scientific merit of the study design and be able to replicate the study, if desired
- Ensuring that the article cites all relevant work by other scientists