

### **The Responsibility of the Peer Reviewer**

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in his specialty field, and is expected to 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 article, suggest ways to improve the strength, soundness, structure and clarity, and quality of the work, and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript. Please be aware about reviewing considerations before, before during, and after reviewing as follow.

### **Before Reviewing**

Please consider the following:

#### **Conflict of Interest**

Reviewers should consider whether they have any conflict(s) of interest that may have an impact on the impartiality of the review. The invitation to review should be declined if any of the following situations apply:

- a. Collaboration with any of the authors in the last 3 years, including, but not limited to publications and current submissions.
- b. Close personal relationship (spouse or family member) or professional connection (past or present PhD students and postdocs) with any of the authors.
- c. Financial interests related to or impacted by the manuscript under review or its topic.

#### **Inability to be objective**

Failure to disclose a conflict of interest will be investigated and may lead to sanctions from the journal. Should the reviewer feel like they can maintain objectivity despite a potential conflict of interest, they are expected to inform the editor or editorial office upon receiving the invitation to review. It is also important for reviewers to remain unbiased by considerations related to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or any other characteristics of the authors, origin of a manuscript.

#### **Does the article 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 alternate reviewer.

#### **Do you have time to review the paper?**

Finished reviews of an article should be completed within three weeks. If you do think you cannot complete the review within this time frame, please let the editor know for possible of extending the time. If you have agreed to review a paper but will no longer be able to finish the work before the deadline, please contact the editor as soon as possible.

### **Are there any potential conflicts of interests?**

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 interests, please do not hesitate to contact the journal editorial office.

### **During the Review**

**When reviewing the article, please keep the following in mind:**

#### **Content Quality and Originality,**

- ✓ How much does the submission contribute to the current state of scholarship?
- ✓ Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
- ✓ Does it add to the standard of knowledge?
- ✓ Does the article follow to the journal's standards?
- ✓ Are the research questions important and the author(s) clearly answering them?
- ✓ You might wish to do a quick literature search using tools such as Scopus to see if there are any reviews of the area. If the research has been covered previously, pass on references of those works to the editor.

#### **Organization and Clarity**

- ✓ Title: Does the title clearly describe the article?
- ✓ Abstract: Does the abstract reflect the content of the article?
- ✓ Introduction: Does the introduction accurately convey the author's objectives and identify the issue under investigation? The introduction often summarizes pertinent studies to offer context and should indicate what findings of other authors are being disputed or expanded upon. The experiment, the hypothesis (es), and the overall experimental design or procedure should all be described.
- ✓ Method: Does the author adequately describe the process used to gather the data? Is the layout appropriate to provide a response to the presented question? Is the information provided sufficient for you to repeat the study? Does the paper specify the methods used? Do these have a purposeful order? Are the new methods thoroughly explained if they are? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the tools and supplies been sufficiently described? Has the author been accurate in describing measurements? Does the article make it clear what kind of data was recorded?
- ✓ Results: in the result section, the authors should verbally describe what they learned during their research. It ought to be logically organized and clearly laid out. You must think about whether the proper analysis has been done. Are the figures accurate? Please

let the editor know when submitting your report if statistics are not your strong suit. This part should not contain results interpretation.

- ✓ **Conclusion/Discussion:** Do the results in this section seem to support and seem logical to you? Have the authors explained how the findings compare to predictions and past studies? Does the article challenge or contradict preexisting theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has advanced our understanding of the field of agricultural sciences?
- ✓ **Tables, Figures, Images:** Are they appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand?

**Scope** - Is the article in line with the aims and scope of the journal?

### **Article Types Considered**

Delivery Science (Original research and review)

### **Original Data and Trials**

Submissions should include data that demonstrates novel approaches for enhancing the systems, procedures, and equipment used in healthcare delivery.

### **Synthesis (Review Articles)**

Submissions should be a critical, systematic review of literature concerning issues that are relevant to the delivery of agricultural sciences and submissions of reviews should be focused on one topic.

### **Final Comments**

All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party. If you would like to discuss the article with a colleague, please ask the editor first and do not contact the author directly.

### **Ethical Issues:**

**Plagiarism:** If you believe that an article substantially resembles another piece of writing, please inform the editor and provide as many specific details as you can.

**Fraud:** Although it is highly challenging to catch a motivated fraudster, you should talk to the editor if you think the findings in an article are false.

**Other ethical issues:** Has the privacy of medical research participants been protected? Has the ethical treatment of either human or animal subjects been compromised in any way? If so, the editor needs to be made aware of these as well.

## **After Reviewing**

Please submit the "Reviewer's Comments" form to the receiving editorial office by the deadline in full. Your full, sincere input will be much valued. The editors will strongly consider your advice for an article when making the final decision.

When writing comments, please specify the section of comments intended for only the editors and the section of comments that can be returned to the author(s). Please never hesitate to contact the editorial office with any questions or concerns you may have.

A good review is a balanced critique of both the positive and negative attributes of the paper; specific feedback is more useful than general comments.