

Double-blind review

Neither authors nor reviewers know each other's identities.

- Author anonymity prevents any reviewer unfairness, for example based on an author's country of origin or previous controversial work.
- Reviewers can often identify the author through their writing style, subject matter or self-citation.

Please consider that the following items are present in your submission and are provided as two distinct documents:

1. TITLE PAGE

The title page should include:

- The manuscript title;
- Authors' names and affiliations;
- An e-mail address for the corresponding author.

This page will remain separate from the manuscript throughout the peer review process and will not be sent to the reviewers.

2. MANUSCRIPT (ANONYMISED)

Author(s) should remove any identifying data (name(s), affiliations etc.).

The key points to consider are:

- Use the third person to refer to your own works previously published. Please write "Alexandrescu (2015) have emphasized" but NOT "I have previously emphasized (Alexandrescu 2015)".
- Choose file names with care and ensure that the file's "**properties**" are also anonymised.
- Pay attention to ensure that you do not accidentally upload identifying data within any of the documents that will be shared with reviewers.

PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Structure of reviewer's text:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| ✓ Originality | ✓ Introduction | ✓ Conclusion/Discussion |
| ✓ Layout and format | ✓ Methodology | ✓ Graphics and tables |
| ✓ Title | ✓ Statistical errors | ✓ Language |
| ✓ Structured abstract | ✓ Results | |

Recommendations:

- Accept
- Minor Revisions
- Major Revisions
- Reject

Your manuscript can be rejected for many reasons (methodological and editorial reasons).

Methodological reasons usually require more work such as further experiments or analysis before your work can be published. Technical reasons for rejection include:

- ✓ partial data
- ✓ poor analysis of data
- ✓ unsuitable methodology for answering your hypothesis
- ✓ your hypothesis is not clear or scientifically valid, or your data does not answer the question posed
- ✓ inexact conclusions on assumptions that are not supported by your data

Editorial reasons for rejection include:

- ✓ out of scope for the journal
- ✓ not enough of an advance or of enough impact for the journal
- ✓ lack of proper structure or not following journal formatting requirements
- ✓ lack of the necessary detail for readers to fully understand and repeat the authors' analysis and experiments
- ✓ references containing a high amount of self-citations
- ✓ poor language quality such that it cannot be understood by readers
- ✓ difficult to follow logic or poorly presented data.
- ✓ violation of publication ethics.

References for peer review process:

- Emerald Publishing. *Reviewer guidelines*. http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/reviewers/reviewer_guidelines.htm
- Elsevier. *Double-blind peer review guidelines*. <https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/what-is-peer-review/peer-review-guidelines>
- Springer. *Peer-review process* <https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/submitting-to-a-journal-and-peer-review/peer-review-process/10534962>