

Scientific Technical Review



ISSN: 1820-0206

Reviewers guidelines

If you accept an invitation to review you shall treat the materials you receive as confidential documents. This means you cannot share them with anyone without prior authorization from the editor. Since peer review is confidential, you shall also not share information about the review with anyone without permission from the editor and authors.

Response to the invitation as soon as you can – a delay in your decision slows down the review process and causes longer waiting period for the author.

Your review will help the editor decide whether or not to publish the paper. It will also aid the author and allow them to improve their manuscript. Giving your overall opinion and general observations of the article is essential. Your comments should be courteous and constructive, and should not include any ad hominem remarks or personal details.

You should explain and support your judgment so that both editors and authors are able to fully understand the reasoning behind your comments. You should indicate whether your comments are your own opinion or are reflected by data and evidence.

If the manuscript you are reviewing is reporting an experiment, check the methods section first. The following cases are considered major flaws and should be flagged: unsound methodology, discredited method, missing processes known to be influential on the area of reported research, a conclusion drawn in contradiction to the statistical or qualitative evidence reported in the manuscript.

For analytical papers examine the sampling report, which is mandated in time-dependent studies. For qualitative research make sure that a systematic data analysis is presented and sufficient descriptive elements with relevant quotes from interviews are listed in addition to the author's narrative.

Once you are satisfied that methodology is sufficiently robust, examine any data in form of figures, tables or images.

When you make a recommendation, it is worth considering the categories the editor will likely use for classifying the article:

- **Reject** (explain your reasons in your report)
- **Accept** without revision
- **Revise** – either major or minor (explain the revision that is required, and indicate to the editor whether you will be glad to review the revised article). If you are recommending a revision, you must provide the author with a clear, sound explanation of why this is necessary.

Whether you recommended acceptance or rejecting the manuscript, keep in mind that one of your goals is to help the authors improve this and future manuscripts.

The editor ultimately decides whether to accept or reject the article. The editor will weight all views and may call for another opinion or ask the author for a revised paper before making a decision.

Do not forget that, even after finalizing your review, you must treat the article and any linked files or data as confidential documents. This means you must not share them or information about the review with anyone without prior authorization from the editor.

Finally, we take the opportunity to thank you sincerely on behalf of the journal, editor and authors for the time you have taken to give your valuable input to the article.