

Reviewers' Guidelines

The Responsibility of the Peer Reviewer

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in their specialty field, and then providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their submission. It is appropriate for the peer reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work, and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript. The (conference) operates a blind peer-review system. Before accepting to review a manuscript, please consider the following:

1. Does the manuscript you are being asked to review match your expertise?

If you receive a manuscript that covers a topic that does not sufficiently match your area of expertise, please notify the editor as soon as possible. Please feel free to recommend an alternate reviewer.

2. Do you have time to review the manuscript?

Finished reviews of a manuscript should be completed within two weeks. If you do not think you can complete the review within this period, please let the editor know and if possible, suggest an alternate reviewer. If you have agreed to review a manuscript but will no longer be able to finish the work before the deadline, please contact the editor as soon as possible.

3. Are there any potential conflicts of interest?

While conflicts of interest will not disqualify you from reviewing the manuscript, it is important to disclose all conflicts of interest to the editors before reviewing. If you have any questions about potential conflicts of interest, please do not hesitate to contact the receiving editorial office.

The Review

When reviewing the manuscript, please keep the following in mind:

- Content Quality and Originality
- Is the manuscript sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
- Does it add to the principle of knowledge?
- Does the manuscript adhere to the (conference)'s standards?

- Is the research question an important one?

Confidentiality

Manuscripts are confidential materials given to a reviewer in trust for the sole purpose of critical evaluation. Reviewers should ensure that the review process is confidential. Details of the manuscript and the review process should remain confidential during and after the review process.

Fairness

Reviews should be honest and objective. Reviewers should not be influenced by:

- The origin of the manuscript
- Religious, political, or cultural viewpoint of the author
- Gender, race, ethnicity, or citizenry of the author

Review Reports

In evaluating a manuscript, reviewers should focus on the following:

- Originality
- Contribution to the field
- Technical quality
- Clarity of presentation
- Depth of research

Reviewers should also:

- Observe that the author has followed the instructions for authors, editorial policies, and publication ethics.
- Observe that the appropriate (conference)'s reporting guidelines are followed. The report should be accurate, objective, constructive, and unambiguous.
- Provide comments that are backed by facts and constructive arguments about the content of the manuscript.
- Avoid using "hostile, derogatory, and accusatory comments".
- Reviewers should not rewrite the manuscript; however, necessary corrections and suggestions for improvements should be made.

Recommendations

Reviewers' recommendation should be either:

- Accepted
- Requires minor corrections
- Requires major revision
- Out of conference scope
- Reject