

## REVIEWER GUIDELINES

Reviewers are invaluable in the maintenance of a high impact factor and reputation of impartiality of the journal. Reviewers provide an unbiased critique of the science of the manuscript and suggest useful feedback on how a paper can be improved. Critiques are viewed by authors as well as editors who use the critique in the decision making process.

Reviewers must abide by the following *IJWD* review guidelines:

- Manuscripts and their standing during the review process must remain confidential.
- Conflicts of interest are to be identified to the Editorial Office immediately.
- Any copies of unpublished manuscripts must be destroyed upon completion of the review.
- A review may be assisted by a colleague who is to be declared in Confidential Comments.
- In a blind review, reviewers are anonymous to the authors, but known to the editors.
- Feedback is to be fair and represented in a tone that is respectful.
- Line numbers are to be used to report specific errors or corrective actions.
- Comments to the authors should not contain any comment as to the acceptability of the manuscript.

A critique should include:

- Comments on the hypothesis.
- A list of specific questions regarding the data and chosen methods.
- Comments on the significance of the findings and if the paper is innovative.
- Designated Major and Minor comments listed at the end of the critique.

Consider the following questions as a guide for your review:

### 1. OVERALL IMPRESSION

- Is the paper clear, crisp, and concise?
- Is the abstract representative of the study?
- Is the format and article type appropriate for the paper?
- Is the paper organized in a logical fashion?

- Is there any unnecessary content (i.e. figures, tables, supplement content, etc.)?
- Does the paper adhere to the format and length requirements of the journal?
- Does the paper require any English language editing?
- Is the experimental data and hypothesis clear?
- Do the references encompass the scope of the work?
- Is the paper ground-breaking, or innovative?
- Is there ambiguity in the methods or data?

### 2. METHODS SECTION

- Are the methods crisp, clear, and concise?
- Can the methods be reproduced?
- Is there any plagiarism or fabrication of data?
- Were the methods appropriate for the study?
- Was there ethical oversight and proper consent obtained?

### 3. RESEARCH FINDINGS

- Originality – does the paper add to previously published literature?
- Do the findings build on the current knowledge base of the field?
- Is the data clearly presented?
- Is there any missing or unnecessary information?
- Was the statistical analysis appropriate and clearly described?
- Are there conflicting ideas from other research?
- Are the findings supported by the data and are they valid?
- Are unsubstantiated statements supported by cited references?
- Are there any inconsistent inferences from the results?

### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- In the Editors Only section provide a decision recommendation for the paper which is clear and supported. This is useful for providing the editors with your expertise as well as a resource to assist in any contested action.

*Thank you for your contribution to *The International Journal of Women's Dermatology**