





Author's Guidelines at a Glance

Initial step

- Match with the area of expertise has to be doublechecked.
- Any conflict of interest has to be disclosed.
- Response to the reviewing invitation has to be provided as soon as possible.

Organizing

- Received materials must be treated as confidential documents.
- Types of feedbacks:
 - **Reject** (with explanation);
 - Accept without revision;
 - **Revise** either major or minor (including comments)

Reviewing

- Importance of research question.
- Originality assessment of the work.
- Identification of strengths and weaknesses.
- Robustness of the methodology and data (if applicable).







Brief Reviewing Protocols for the Authors

- "Examine the importance of the research question addressed in the manuscript (e.g., are objectives and justification clearly stated?).
- Assess the originality (contribution, addition of knowledge to scientific literature or field) of the manuscript.
- Clearly identify the strengths and weaknesses of the method described in the manuscript.
- Make specific useful comments on the writing of the manuscript (e.g., writing, organization, figures, etc.).
- Offer specific comments on the author's interpretation of the results and conclusions drawn from the results.
- In case applicable, comment on the statistics (for example question if they are robust and fit-for-purpose and if the controls and sampling mechanisms are sufficient and well described).
- 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"







Flow of the Reviewing Process

