Future Medicine Guide to Performing Peer Review

This document outlines how to perform peer review via our online submission system. We recommend you read these guidelines in full before agreeing to act as a reviewer.

All Future Science Group journals process article submissions via ScholarOne Manuscripts. For detailed user guides, video tutorials and more from ScholarOne Manuscripts, please visit the website here: mchelp.manuscriptcentral.com/gethelpnow/training/reviewer/

Contents
What is peer review? ..................................................................................................................... 2
The peer review process ................................................................................................................... 2
Performing a review .......................................................................................................................... 3
  Questionnaire ............................................................................................................................... 3
  Detailed comments ....................................................................................................................... 3
  Contacting the Editor .................................................................................................................... 4
Further review ................................................................................................................................. 4
Transfer of papers & peer review comments between journals ..................................................... 4
Available tools & resources............................................................................................................. 5
**What is peer review?**

Peer review enhances the quality of articles published in academic journals. Experts in the field are invited by the journal to assess the validity and novelty of submitted papers and will ultimately inform an Editor’s decision to accept or reject an article. In addition, comments generated through peer review help authors improve their work.

Although the process of peer review has undergone, and continues to undergo, debate, it remains the globally accepted model for scientific publishing. The three main types of peer review are:

- Single blind: the identities of the reviewers are anonymized but author names are visible
- Double blind: both the reviewer and author identities are anonymous
- Open peer review: the author and reviewer identities are available to all participants

All Future Medicine journals employ *double-blind peer review*.

By taking part in peer review, reviewers contribute to the quality of the published literature and support their fellow researchers, while staying abreast of advances in their field. If you would like to be a reviewer, please contact the journal directly, including information on your areas of expertise. Alternatively, you may create an account on the relevant journal submission site here, including relevant keywords representing your areas of expertise. A full list of journals can be found on our website, with contact information available here.

---

**The peer review process**

[Diagram of the peer review process]

- Article submitted
- Editors initially assess the article
- Reviewers assess the article
- Editors make decision, based on reviewer feedback
- Article returned to authors for revisions
- Editors make decision on revised manuscript
- Accepted
- Rejected (i.e., review identifies poor-quality research)
- Accepted
- Rejected (i.e., if out of scope for journal)
- Article requires further review
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Performing a review

There are several points to consider before accepting an invitation to review an article:

- Does the review timeline suit your schedule?
  - If not, suggestions for alternative reviewers are highly appreciated
- Is the topic within my expertise?
  - You should be comfortable assessing the article for novelty, scientific accuracy and importance

Once you’ve accepted an invitation, you’ll have access to the ScholarOne Manuscripts Reviewer Center. To begin with, we recommend that you read the journal’s Aims and Scope and access our Author Guidelines for further information on article types and their criteria.

Questionnaire

Your Reviewer Center includes the following questionnaire with useful considerations for you to base your review around. Not all sections of the questionnaire will be applicable, depending on the type of article you are reviewing (i.e., Review articles vs Original Research) – in these circumstances you can select ‘Not applicable’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 Is the problem significant and concisely stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 Are the methods described comprehensively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7 Is the language acceptable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 Please rate the priority for publishing this article (1 is the highest priority, 10 is the lowest priority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed comments

Beneath the questionnaire, there is also space for you to submit more detailed comments. For this section please bear the following in mind:

- DO number your comments, to aid the authors when they return their responses
- DO justify your responses to the earlier questionnaire, giving examples from the text and using line numbers where possible. Vague comments are more difficult for the Editor to interpret, and for authors to address appropriately. This applies whether you are recommending acceptance, rejection or revision of the article
- DO provide suggestions for further references where appropriate
• **DO** raise any **ethical concerns** with the Editor (there is a section to return any confidential comments you would like to send for the attention of the Editor only)

• **DO** consider the journal’s **target audience**

• **DON’T** comment specifically or extensively on **English language or grammar**, unless it is detrimental to the understanding of the data

• **DON’T** share the article with any colleagues; this is a breach of publication ethics

**Contacting the Editor**

If, during the course of your review, you find you’re unqualified to act as a reviewer, are unable to meet the deadline or simply have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us. It is particularly important, if you have been invited to perform an expedited review, that you inform the editorial team immediately if you are unable to meet the specified deadline. If this is the case, please reply to the email address included in your invitation email, ensuring you include the manuscript ID number of the paper you have been invited to review.

**Further review**

If the revisions requested by reviewers after the first round of review are particularly extensive, the Editor may decide to send the revised manuscript for further review when it is re-submitted by the authors. If so, you will be given the opportunity to accept or decline this invitation. You may also indicate during your initial review whether you would be willing to review subsequent versions of the paper.

When conducting further review, the comments do not need to be as detailed as the first time you reviewed the article; however, you will be asked to assess whether the author has addressed your previous critiques sufficiently. Of course, any additional comments at this stage are appreciated.

**Transfer of papers & peer review comments between journals**

The popularity of our journals means some are unable to publish every manuscript with merit. The journal Editor may also feel in some cases that a manuscript would be better suited to another journal’s scope and audience. Therefore, in some instances, articles declined by a journal will be given the opportunity to have their articles transferred to a suitable sister publication in the Future Science Group portfolio. This may take place before or after the peer review process and is at the discretion of the Editor. For articles that have already undergone peer review in the original publication, the initial peer review will also be transferred. The ease of transfer and portability of peer reviews helps to decrease the time taken to a final decision. **Reviewers should be aware of this possibility when they submit their review.**

The journal offered to authors as a transfer option will be chosen by the Editor as the most suitable for the manuscript in question. This could be a hybrid journal or **Future Science OA**, the broad-scope open access journal from Future Science. All journals published by Future Science Group meet high publication standards, underpinned by our peer reviewers.
Available tools & resources

- Methods reporting standards
  - Future Medicine Methods Reporting Checklist for Authors: [https://www.futuremedicine.com/authorguide/preparingyourarticle](https://www.futuremedicine.com/authorguide/preparingyourarticle)

- Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE): [https://publicationethics.org/](https://publicationethics.org/)
  - COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers: [https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers](https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers)

- Diagnostic accuracy studies

- Observational research studies

- Systematic reviews and meta-analyses

- Randomized controlled trials