

Guidelines for Reviewers

Reviewer Guidelines

Reviewers are kindly requested to evaluate the manuscript objectively and constructively. Comments should focus on the scientific quality, originality, methodological rigor, clarity, and contribution of the manuscript. Reviewers should provide specific comments that can help the authors improve their manuscript.

1. Originality and Contribution

Does the manuscript present original and significant findings or insights that justify publication? Does it make a clear contribution to the existing body of knowledge?

2. Relationship to the Literature

Does the manuscript demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature? Are appropriate and sufficiently recent sources cited? Has any significant or relevant work been overlooked?

3. Methodology

Is the research question or objective clearly defined? Is the theoretical or conceptual basis appropriate? Is the study design sound and appropriate for addressing the research question? Are the methods adequately described and appropriately applied? Are the statistical or analytical procedures, where applicable, appropriate?

4. Results

Are the results presented clearly and logically? Are the analyses appropriate and correctly interpreted? Do the results adequately address the research questions or objectives?

5. Discussion and Conclusions

Does the discussion appropriately interpret the findings in relation to the research questions and the existing literature? Are the conclusions supported by the findings? Does the manuscript clearly distinguish between evidence-based conclusions and speculation?

6. Implications and Significance

Does the manuscript clearly identify the implications of its findings for research, practice, education, policy, and/or society, where appropriate? Are the stated implications consistent with the findings and conclusions?

7. Quality of Communication and Presentation

Is the manuscript clearly and coherently written? Is the terminology appropriate for the journal's readership? Are the language, sentence structure, use of technical terms and acronyms, tables, figures, and overall presentation sufficiently clear?

8. Ethical Considerations

Where applicable, does the manuscript adequately address ethical issues, including research ethics approval, informed consent, conflicts of interest, and other relevant ethical requirements?

9. Use of Artificial Intelligence in Peer Review

Reviewers must not upload a submitted manuscript, or any portion of it, to an AI tool, since doing so could on the authors' confidentiality and proprietary rights.

Reviewers continue to bear full responsibility and accountability for what their review reports contain. AI tools may thus be used only in a supporting role, such as refining the language and structure of a review report or helping with a background literature search, as long as confidentiality is preserved and human control and oversight are maintained.

Also, editors are permitted to employ AI tools only in a supporting role, such as enhancing the wording or organization of their decision letters, or helping with a literature search, as long as confidentiality is preserved and human control and oversight are maintained.

Reviewers ought to reveal any AI usage in their review reports, specifying the tool employed and the reason for its use. Simple spelling and grammar checks are not required to be disclosed.

disclosure statement:

While preparing this report, I utilized [NAME OF TOOL / SERVICE] for the purpose of [REASON]. Following my use of this tool/service, I reviewed and revised the content where necessary, and I accept full responsibility for its content.

10. Recommendation

Please select one of the following recommendations:

- **Accept Submission**
- **Revision Required**
- **Submit for Review**
- **Resubmit Elsewhere**
- **Declined Submission**
- **See Comments**

11. Comments to the Authors

Reviewers should provide clear, specific, and constructive comments that explain the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript and identify revisions that are necessary or would substantially improve the work.

Comments should:

- distinguish major concerns from minor issues;
- refer to specific sections, methods, results, or claims where possible;
- explain the scientific or methodological basis for important criticisms;
- avoid personal or disparaging remarks; and
- provide constructive suggestions where appropriate.

Reviewers should not request unnecessary citations, including citations to their own work, the work of colleagues, or articles from the journal, unless those references are genuinely relevant and necessary.

Where appropriate and permitted by the journal's submission system, reviewers may provide comments or suggested revisions directly in the manuscript file and upload the annotated file together with their review. Reviewers should ensure that annotations do not inadvertently reveal their identity in a blinded review process.

Reviewers may provide confidential comments to the editor concerning matters that are not appropriate to communicate to the authors, such as:

- potential ethical or research integrity concerns;
- undisclosed conflicts of interest;
- concerns about plagiarism, duplicate publication, data fabrication, or falsification;
- concerns about the suitability or safety of a study; or
- other information that may assist the editor in making an informed editorial decision.

Confidential comments should not be used to introduce substantive criticisms that are withheld from the authors without a compelling reason.

12. Timeliness and Declining a Review

Reviewers are encouraged to accept a review invitation only when they have the appropriate expertise and sufficient time to complete the review within the requested timeframe.

If a reviewer cannot complete the review within the requested period, they should decline the invitation promptly. Where possible, reviewers may suggest alternative qualified reviewers to the editor.

By accepting a review invitation, reviewers agree to comply with these guidelines and with the journal's applicable policies on publication ethics, confidentiality, and research integrity.

Guidelines for Reviewers