

PAGEPress Style

THE REVIEWER'S MANUAL

1.	Review policies	3
1.1.	Recommendations on publication ethics policies for medical journals	3
2.	How to use the system	5
2.1.	How to accept the review request and download the manuscript ..	5
2.2.	How to upload your comments and recommendations	6
2.2.1.	Review Form	8

Non-commercial use only

CONTACT

Non-commercial use only

CHAPTER 1.

Review policies

All PAGEPress journals follow the WAME Recommendations on Publication Ethics Policies for Medical Journals about peer review (<http://www.wame.org/resources/ethics-resources/publication-ethics-policies-for-medical-journals/>).

1.1. Recommendations on publication ethics policies for medical journals

The WAME recommendations concerning the peer review process are reported below. Peer review process is fundamental to the scientific publication process. Peer reviewers are experts chosen by Editors to provide written assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of written research, with the aim of improving the reporting of research and identifying the most appropriate and highest quality material for the journal. Peer reviewers should be experts in the scientific topic addressed in the articles they review, and should be selected for their objectivity and scientific knowledge. Individuals who have a major competing interest in the subject of the article (*e.g.*, those working for a company whose product was tested, its competitors, those with special political or ideological agendas, etc.) should not act as peer reviewers. Reviews will be expected to be professional, honest, courteous, prompt, and constructive. The desired major elements of a high-quality review should be as follows:

- i) the reviewer should identify and comment on major strengths and weaknesses of study design and methodology;
- ii) the reviewer should comment accurately and constructively upon the quality of the author's interpretation of the data, including acknowledgment of its limitations;
- iii) the reviewer should comment on major strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript as a written communication, independent of the design, methodology, results, and interpretation of the study;
- iv) the reviewer should comment on any ethical concerns raised by the study, or any possible evidence of low standards of scientific conduct;
- v) the reviewer should provide the author with useful suggestions for improving the manuscript;
- vi) the reviewer should comment on the adherence of the manuscript to the Journal guidelines;
- vii) the reviewer should verify the bibliographic references (whether data are accurate, complete, easy to find, etc., or not);
- viii) the reviewer's comments to the author should be constructive and professional;
- ix) the review should provide the Editor with the context and perspective needed to make a decision on acceptance (and/or revision) of the manuscript.

CONTACT

Editorial Office - PAGEPress Publications
Via A. Cavagna Sangiuliani, 5 - 27100 Pavia, Italy - Tel. +39.0382.464340 - Fax. +39.0382.34872
office@pagepress.org

The submitted manuscript is a privileged communication; reviewers must treat it as confidential. It should not be retained or copied. Also, reviewers must not share the manuscript with any colleagues without the explicit permission of the editor. Reviewers and Editors must not make any personal or professional use of the data, arguments, or interpretations (other than those directly involved in its peer review) prior to publication unless they have the Authors' specific permission or are writing an editorial or commentary to accompany the article. If Reviewers suspect misconduct, they should notify the Editor in confidence, and should not share their concerns with other parties unless officially notified by the Journal that they may do so.

Non-commercial use only

CHAPTER 2.

How to use the system

2.1. How to accept the review request and download the manuscript

When you are assigned as a Reviewer, you receive a 'Review request' message with the link to the submission: you do not have to enter your Username and Password, because only clicking the same link you can access the review page (if the link does not work due to a different browser setup, contact the Managing Editor).

In the e-mail you receive you can see the deadline for completing the review and the deadline for logging in, in order to accept/decline our request. Be so kind as to reply in a few days, so that we can be informed about your availability or not, and avoid delays.

Should you be overcommitted and have to decline our request, inform us that you need to be replaced. In that case, a suggestion for other suitable and reliable reviewers with sufficient experience in the field related to the paper is much appreciated.

To accept (and download the paper)/decline the review request, follow the instructions below:

- i) to access the review page of the paper, click on the URL provided in the 'Review request' message;
- ii) on the review page, you can see the section 'Review Steps';
- iii) the first Step requires you to accept or refuse the review (in this way the system informs us that you are able to do the review). **Only if you accept, are you allowed to see the paper;**
- iv) to accept, click on the small envelope 'Will do the review' (Figure 1);
- v) download the paper (and supplementary files, if any);
- vi) review the paper accordingly to our policies (see Chapter 1).

CONTACT

Editorial Office - PAGEPress Publications
Via A. Cavagna Sangiuliani, 5 - 27100 Pavia, Italy - Tel. +39.0382.464340 - Fax. +39.0382.34872
office@pagepress.org

example

Home > User > Reviewer > #556 > Review



#556 Review

Submission To Be Reviewed

Title [Air embolism during arthrography for developmental dysplasia of the hip - case report](#)

Journal Section Case Reports

Abstract Arthrography is useful method to evaluate obstruct factors and the congruity of the femoral head for developmental dysplasia of the hip. We usually use an air injection to ascertain whether the needle is accurately insert intraarticularly, because leakage of the contrast medium may make it difficult to identify intraarticular structure in the hip joint. We report the experience the case that suspected air embolism by air injection in the arthrogram. An air injection for arthrography must be avoided the case of infants. To confirm that a needle is correctly inserted intraarticularly, it is preferable to inject saline. Alternatively, it may be suitable to use sonography for confirming the position of the needle for arthrography.

Submission Editor Paola Granata 
Camillo Porta 

Submission Metadata [VIEW METADATA](#)

Review Schedule

Editor's Request	2012-11-02
Your Response	—
Review Submitted	—
Review Due	2012-11-16

Review Steps



1. Notify the submission's editor as to whether you will undertake the review.
 Response [Will do the review](#)  [Unable to do the review](#) 

Figure 1

2.2. How to upload your comments and recommendations

When you have finished your review, do not send your comments to the Authors directly or to the Editors via e-mail, but follow the instructions below:

- i) log into the Journal;
- ii) select your role as 'Reviewer' and click on the manuscript title (Figures 2 and 3);

example

Home > User Home

User Home

Clinics and Practice

» [Reviewer](#) [1 Active](#)

My Account

- » [Edit My Profile](#)
- » [Change My Password](#)
- » [Log Out](#)

Figure 2

Home > User > Reviewer > Active Submissions

Active Submissions

active archive

ID	MM-DD ASSIGNED	SEC	TITLE	DUE	REVIEW ROUND
556	11-02	CR	<u>AIR EMBOLISM DURING ARTHROGRAPHY FOR DEVELOPMENTAL...</u>	11-16	1

1 - 1 of 1 Items

Figure 3


example

- iii) enter your comments (preferred) at Step 4 (Figure 4);
- iv) upload a file (optional) at Step 5;
- v) select your recommendation at Step 6 and click 'Submit Review To Editor' to inform the Editors that you have completed your task.

Please note that when you register the Recommendation, the system will register your final action, sending us the 'Article review completed' message; at this point you cannot add further comments or upload any additional file.

Review Steps

1. Notify the submission's editor as to whether you will undertake the review.
Response Accepted
2. If you are going to do the review, consult Reviewer Guidelines below.
3. Click on file names to download and review (on screen or by printing) the files associated with this submission.

<u>Submission Manuscript</u>	<u>558-3760-1-RV.DOCX</u>	2012-10-20
<u>Supplementary File(s)</u>	<u>558-3759-1-SP.DOC</u>	
4. Click on icon to enter (or paste) your review of this submission.
Review  **← Insert your comments here**
5. In addition, you can upload files for the editor and/or author to consult.

Uploaded files	None
<input type="text"/>	<input type="button" value="Sfogliare..."/> <input type="button" value="Upload"/>
6. Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Recommendation	<input type="text" value="Choose One"/>	<input type="button" value="Submit Review To Editor"/>
----------------	---	--

Reviewer Guidelines

All of our journals follows the **WAME Recommendations on Publication Ethics Policies for Medical Journals** about peer-review.

Recommendations on Publication Ethics Policies for Medical Journals.

The WAME recommendations concerning Peer Review are reported below. Peer Review Peer review is fundamental to the scientific publication process and the dissemination of sound science. Peer reviewers are experts chosen by editors to provide written assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of written research, with the aim of improving the reporting of research and identifying the most

Figure 4

example

2.2.1. Review Form

A few journals provide a fixed Reviewers' Form with prepared questions which has to be filled in entirely. It is available from the same review page at Step 5 (Figure 5).

example

Review Steps

1. Notify the submission's editor as to whether you will undertake the review.
Response Accepted
2. If you are going to do the review, consult Reviewer Guidelines below.
3. Click on file names to download and review (on screen or by printing) the files attached to the submission.

Submission Manuscript	596-2985-1-RV.DOC	2012-09-12
Supplementary File(s)	None	
4. Declare whether or not you have competing interests with regard to this research.
No competing interests known
5. Click on icon to fill in the review form.
[Review Form](#)

Figure 5

IMPORTANT: do not forget to click on 'Save' before closing the Form.

A standard template of a Review Form is shown in Figure 6.

Home > User > Reviewer > #596 > Review Form Response

Review Form Response

NRRep Reviewers

to all reviewers - please use this form

Does this paper fall within the scope of this journal? *

Yes
 No
 N/A

Does this paper fall within the scope of this journal? Comments

The topic is of interest to those working in the field of intensive care be it education, practice or research.

Does the title reflect the content of the article? *

Yes
 No
 N/A

Does the title reflect the content of the article? Comments

From the title I was expecting the context and development of nursing practice in relation to enteral feeding in intensive care, with evidence of current nursing practice, with a discussion on adherence and then a critique of the literature.

Is the abstract informative? *

Yes
 No
 N/A

Is the abstract informative? Comments

Consideration needs to be given to the structure, flow and sentence structure. The objectives section says 'some clinical practices' will be taken into consideration the reasons for the selection of these, needs to be made clear.

Is the study justified from sufficient empirical literature? *

Yes
 No
 N/A

Figure 6

example