

Guidelines for Peer-Reviewers

SCIRP has a **review process** called “single blind open review choice”. This offers a reviewer the choice to

- reveal himself / herself to the corresponding author and to ask for clarification and supporting data,
- to give general hints to the corresponding author (please put the editor guiding the review process in CC in your e-mails),
- to be mentioned as reviewer in the title footnote of the reviewed paper,
- to be mentioned as reviewer in an Editorial together with journal statistics published annually,
- to be credited for the effort and input to the journal on a (subordinate) web page of the journal.

The **spirit of the SCIRP review** is characterized by appreciation, support, and mentoring. We want to bring the manuscript to the stage of a good final paper which is providing useful information to readers worldwide. If the reviewer gets in a conversation with the author, the reviewer may not make any comments on the chances of the manuscript getting published. This final decision is made by the editor after considering and balancing the comments of all reviewers. Also the final comments to the author are written by the editor as a balanced summary of the advice given by all reviewers and editors.

Reviewer’s Open Review Choice

Please replace X by if statement does not apply.

Please credit me as reviewer of the reviewed paper in the title footnote of this reviewed paper and in an Editorial written and published annually based on journal statistics.

X ... with my name but without my affiliation.

X ... with my name and in addition also with my affiliation.

I would like to be listed as a reviewer to the journal on a (subordinate) web page of the journal.

X ... with my name but without my affiliation.

X ... with my name and in addition also with my affiliation.

Hints for Reviewer to Fill in the Review Form

Please tick the appropriate box with X

- 1.) Does the topic fall into the “Aims & Scope” of the journal as listed on the web page?
- 2.) As reviewer and expert in the field you may be aware of many facts. However, please consider that the authors and readers rely on easily reachable open literature and may not be aware of research work performed by other researchers available only as proprietary information or as information behind pay bars. Is the work original and novel in this respect? The journal aims to provide useful information that can at best be directly applied by the reader. Could the results also be obtained by the reader following the stated method? Is the method described such to be put to work also for the reader? Are links provided to additional data, methods, or programs on the Internet?
- 3.) Please check for a sound scientific approach. Is the content technically accurate and are the conclusions adequately supported by the results?
- 4.) Does the manuscript follow accepted principles of scientific writing? Is the manuscript sufficiently based also on other research? Is the material presented ordered logically? Is the style of writing clear and goal oriented? Are title and abstract consistent with the content of the paper? Do equations, illustrations, and tables clarify the methodology and the results shown in the paper? Does the English language need improvement?

The ticks in the table above provide the summary of your answers to these questions. You may want to address specific issues below in more detail. Please give as much insight into the manuscript as your precious time allows.

You can also do a partial review. In this case please specify in which areas or aspects of the manuscript you have looked and which other areas you are leaving to other reviewers.

It is especially important to write comments directly into the Word or PDF file of the manuscript. This can greatly simplify the communication.