**Wiley’s Top 10 tips for peer reviewers**

1. **When you receive an invitation to review, the article’s abstract will help you decide whether it’s within your area of interest and expertise. Remember to respond promptly or else you might delay the process.**
2. **Keep the contents of any manuscripts you’re reviewing confidential. What’s more, if you’ve submitted similar research of your own, or if you’ve reviewed the article for a different journal, let the editor know there’s a conflict of interest. Agreeing to a review for personal gain is not ethical practice.**
3. **When commenting, make sure your remarks stay within the scope of the paper and don’t veer of subject. If you’re unclear of the scope, editorial policy, presentation and submission requirements, speak to the editor or read the Author Guidelines.**
4. **Your review should ultimately help the author improve the paper. Be sure to offer some constructive feedback, even if your recommendation ends up being to reject.**
5. **Carefully analyzing and commenting on a manuscript can take a good chunk of time. Make sure you have enough time available when taking on a review.**
6. **Structure your comments by numbering them and dividing them into major and minor issues to help authors prioritize corrections. Make sure your comments to authors correspond to your assessment on the confidential review and review checklists/score sheets.**
7. **If you’re reviewing a paper that’s in English but wasn’t written by a native speaker, it’s good to be tolerant and point out elements that change the meaning, rather than commenting on the quality of their English.**
8. **Read the conclusion first. It will give you a good idea as to whether the research is an exciting development within its own field.**
9. **Editors need it useful if you comment on the number of replicates, controls and statistical analyses. Strong statistics are crucial to determining whether the outcome is robust.**
10. **If a paper you’re reviewing is really good and an excellent addition to the existing literature, don’t be afraid to say so.**

**Please note the options which best describe your reaction to the Paper. For extra details, prepare a separate report if you prefer.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. ORIGINALITY: []**  a. Never been done before  b. Plagiarized content  c. Minor variation on a known technique  d. Re-invention of a known technique | **2.SIGNIFICANCE: []**  a. Important problem of current interest  b. Part of a problem of current interest  c. An interesting insight  d. Recreational |
| **3. DETAIL [b]**  a. unnecessarily detailed  b**.** Appropriate information provided  c. Enough for the referee to repeat the work  d. Reduce the details | **4. REFERENCES []**  a. Too many background references of marginal value  b. virtually the same references the referee would have cited  c. Out-of-date references: to old work only  d. shallow references: to new work only |
| **5. RECOMMENDATION [b]**  a. Accept as it is  b. Minor revision  c. Major revision  d. reject | |
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