

## Sample Peer Review Guidelines

The Sample Journal practices a policy of double-anonymous review, where each review is subject to two reviews by anonymous peers mediated by the Journal's editors. The Sample Journal's peer review process is an opportunity for referees to participate in our mission to produce high quality scholarship and create a supportive environment where emerging scholars can experience the review and editing process. Reviewers for Sample Journal are expected to provide personal and professional opinions based on their expertise and to deliver thoughtful and constructive feedback based on their consideration of the articles under review.

Please consider the following when conducting your review:

- When approached please agree to review only if you have the necessary experience and knowledge to assess the manuscript and can be unbiased in your assessment.
- Be specific in your critique, and provide supporting evidence with appropriate references to substantiate general statements, to help editors in their evaluation.
- Be constructive in your review, providing feedback that will help the authors to improve their manuscript.
- Be congenial and clear. Confidential comments to the editor should not be a place to denigrate the author, simply because they will not see them.
- Remember it is the author's paper, which should not be rewritten in your own preferred style if it is basically sound and clear; suggestions for changes that improve clarity are, however, important.
- In addition, be aware of language issues that are due to the author writing in a language that is not their first or most proficient language, and phrase your feedback appropriately and with due respect.
- Comment on the quality and rigour of the work; If the article is not clear because of missing analyses, the explain what additional discussion would clarify the argument.

**Confidentiality:** Respect the confidentiality of the peer review process. Do not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript (including early career researchers you are mentoring), without obtaining permission from the journal. The names of any individuals who have helped with the review should be included so that they are associated with the manuscript in the journal's records and can also receive recognition for their efforts.

**Bias and competing interests:** It is important to remain unbiased in regard to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, origins of a manuscript or by commercial considerations. If you discover a competing interest that might prevent you from providing a fair and unbiased review, notify the journal and seek advice. Similarly, notify the journal as soon as possible if you find you do not have the necessary expertise to assess the manuscript.

**Suspicion of ethics violations:** If you come across any suspected breaches in publication ethics please let the journal know. In the case of any other ethical concerns, contact the editor directly and do not attempt to investigate on your own.

**For more on Peer Review guidance, please refer to:**

[PLOS Reviewer Center](#)

COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers: [publicationethics.org](http://publicationethics.org)

Wiley Online Library: [How to Perform a Peer Review](#)