REVIEWING THE MANUSCRIPT

A} First impressions

1] Is the research original, novel and important to the field ?

2] Has the appropriate structure and language been used ?

B} Abstract

1] Is it really a summary ?

2] Does it include key findings ?

3] Is it an appropriate length ?

C} Introduction

1] Is it effective, clear, well organized ?

2] Does it really introduced and put into perspective what follows ?

3] Suggest changes in organization and point authors to appropriate citations

4] Be specific, don’t write “the authors have done a poor job”

D} Methodology

1] Can a colleague reproduce the experiments and get the same outcomes ?

2] Did the authors include proper references to previously published methodology

3] Is the description of new methodology accurate ?

4] Could or should the authors have included supplementary material ?

E} Results and Discussion

1] Suggest improvements in the way data is shown

2] Comment on general logic and on justification of interpretations and conclusions

3] Comment on the number of figures, tables and schemes

4] Write concisely and precisely which changes you recommend

5] List separately suggested changes in style, grammer and other small changes

6] Suggest additional experiments or analysis

7] Make clear the need for changes / updates

8] Ask yourself whether the manuscript should be published at all

F} Conclusion

1] Comment on importance, validity and generality of conclusions

2] Request toning down of unjustified claims and generalizations

3] Request removal of redundancies and summaries

4] The abstract, not the conclusion, summarizes the study

G} References, tables, Figures

1] Check accuracy, number and citation appropriateness

2] Comment on any footnotes

3] Comment on figures, their quality and readability

4] Assess completeness of legends, headers and axis labels

5] Check presentation consistency

6] Comment on need for colour in figure.

COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR

1] Comment on novelty and significance

2] Recommend whether the manuscript is suitable for publication

3] Confidential comments will not be disclosed to the authors

EDITORS VIEW: WHAT MAKES A GOOD REVIEWER

1] Provides a thorough and comprehensive report

2] Submits the report on time

3] Provides well – founded comments for authors

4] Gives constructive criticism

5] Demonstrates objectivity

6] Provides a clear recommendation to the editor

* **Reject**(explain your reasoning in your report)
* **Accept**without revision
* **Revise**– either major or minor (explain the revision that is required, and indicate to the editor whether you would be happy to review the revised article). If you are recommending a revision, you must furnish the author with a clear, sound explanation of why this is necessary.

Please email to: icfceet@gmail.com