

## **Instructions for reviewers**

When reviewing a manuscript, please keep in mind that it should conform to the ANM and manuscript preparation guidelines outlined in the Instructions for Authors (see <http://www.springer.com/medicine/nuclear+medicine/journal/12149>). Submitted manuscripts should be reviewed in terms of originality, significance, and adequacy of documentation. Comments should contain clear opinions about strengths, weaknesses, relevance, and importance to the field of Nuclear Medicine. Reviewers should consider themselves as mentors of the authors. Specific comments that cite manuscript sections, pages, paragraphs, or lines are most helpful to the authors. The ANM appreciates prompt reviews.

Reviewers should take responsibility for maintaining confidentiality of the manuscript. Reviewers should not retain copies of submitted manuscripts for personal use after completing a review. Reviewers may not make any use of the work described in the manuscript or take advantage of the knowledge gained by reviewing it until and unless it is published.

The ANM conducts a single-blinded peer-review process; therefore, it is considered a violation of this process for peer reviewers to identify themselves or attempt to communicate directly with authors regarding the manuscript without the permission of the Editors.

When reviewing a manuscript, please consider the following points:

- Is the topic of the manuscript appropriate for the Journal?
- Is the information of significant interest to the readers?
- Does the title accurately reflect the major findings of the work?
- Does the abstract clearly summarize the background, methodology, results, and significance of the study?
- Do key words represent the article adequately?
- Is the purpose or objective clearly stated?
- Are the methods appropriate and scientifically sound?
- Are appropriate statistical tests used?
- Are the conclusions supported by the data presented?
- Are the tables and figures well designed to gain a better understanding of the text?
- Is information in the tables and figures not duplicated in the text?

- Do the references cited appropriately support the manuscript?
- Should the manuscript be shortened?

After careful consideration, the reviewer should provide one of the following recommendations to the Editor regarding publication:

- Accept as is – for high quality manuscripts of significant interest to most readers.
- Accept with minor revision – for manuscripts of acceptable quality that are of interest to most readers, but which require some modifications to improve the quality of the manuscript.
- Major revision with re-evaluation – for manuscripts of quality not high enough but possessing unique information. The manuscripts should be extensively revised and be evaluated again for the suitability of publication.
- Reject – for manuscripts of low quality or of low interest to readers.