

## Guidelines for Reviewers

The unpublished manuscript under peer review is a privileged document. 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.

Reviewers are requested to help authors improve their manuscript. The report should give constructive analysis to authors, particularly where revisions are recommended. Where reviewers do not wish authors to see certain comments, these can be added to the confidential comments to the Editor column in peer review sheet.

Suggested revisions should be couched as such and not expressed as conditions for acceptance. Please distinguish between revisions considered essentials and those merely desirable.

The editor gratefully receives a reviewer's recommendations, nonetheless the editorial decisions are usually based on evolutions derived from several sources, a reviewer should not expect the editor to honor his or her every recommendation.

### Reviewers should consider the following core aspects on the manuscript as far as applicable:

- Importance (clinical or otherwise) of the question or subject studied
- Scientific reliability?
- Originality (truly original or known to you through foreign or specialist publications or through the grapevine)
- Adequacy of summary, key words.
- Patients (sample size) studied, adequately described and their condition defined?

- Appropriateness of approach or experimental design, adequacy of experimental techniques (including statistics where appropriate, need for statistical assessment).
- Methods adequately described?
- Results relevant to problem posed? Credible? Well presented?
- Soundness of conclusions and interpretation. Interpretation and conclusions warranted by the data? Reasonable speculation? Is the message clear?
- Relevance of discussion
- References up to date and relevant? Any glaring omissions?
- Relevance of the figures and table, clarity of legends and titles.
- Suitability for the journal and overall recommendations. Appropriate for general readerships or more appropriate for specialist journal?
- If not acceptable can the paper be made acceptable?
- Ethical aspects
- Overall presentation (including writing style, clarity of writing)