



Reviewer Form | Editorial Office | Anonymous Reviewer

Manuscript title:

Date sent to the reviewer:

Date returned from the reviewer:

Evaluation (Rate: 1 = Excellent; 2 = Good; 3 = Fair; 4 = Poor)

Originality

Contribution to the field

Technical quality

Clarity of Presentation

Depth of research

Report (200 words approx.)

Decision

Accept

Accept with amendments

Reject with option to resubmit

Reject

CONDUCTING A REVIEW

Confidentiality

Respect the confidentiality of the peer review process and refrain from using information obtained during the peer review process for your own or another's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others (eg, see COPE Case 14-06: Possible breach of reviewer confidentiality) (<http://cope.onl/case-breach>).

Bias and competing interests

It is important to remain unbiased by considerations related to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, origins of a manuscript or by commercial considerations.

If you discover a competing interest that might prevent you from providing a fair and unbiased review, notify the journal and seek advice (eg, see COPE Case 15-05: Reviewer requests to be added as an author after publication) (<https://cope.onl/case-author>).

Suspicion of ethics violations

If you come across any irregularities with respect to research and publication ethics do let the journal know (eg, see COPE Case 02-11: Contacting research ethics committees with concerns over studies) (<https://cope.onl/case-research>).

PREPARING A REPORT

Follow journals' instructions for writing and posting the review. If a particular format or scoring rubric is required, use the tools supplied by the journal. Be objective and constructive in your review, providing feedback that will help the authors to improve their manuscript. For example, be specific in your critique, and provide supporting evidence with appropriate references to substantiate general statements, to help editors in their evaluation. Be professional and refrain from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libellous or derogatory personal comments or unfounded accusations (eg, see COPE Case 08-13: Personal remarks within a post-publication literature forum) (<https://cope.onl/case-remarks>).

Appropriate feedback

Bear in mind that the editor requires a fair, honest, and unbiased assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. Ensure your comments and recommendations for the editor are consistent with your report for the authors; most feedback should be put in the report that the authors will see.

FURTHER READING

COPE Council. COPE Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers — English.
<https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9> Version 2: September 2017.