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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.
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.
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);
vii) review the paper accordingly to our policies (see Chapter 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);
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.
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 Form](image)

**IMPORTANT:** do not forget to click on ‘Save’ before closing the Form.
A standard template of a Review Form is shown in Figure 6.