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- Any copies of unpublished manuscripts must be destroyed upon completion of the review.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.
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