

Guidelines to IJRUME reviewers

Thank you for undertaking a review on behalf of IJRUME.

As IJRUME endorses the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Reviewers, we kindly ask that you read these at [Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers \(English\) | COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics](#).

An accepted manuscript is expected to be of high quality, to make significant contributions to the field and should be of interest to IJRUME readers. Where appropriate, the study should be grounded in existing research; the design should be appropriate; and, the conclusions should follow from the data.

Together with other reviews and a summary from the Editors, your review will be anonymised and forwarded to the author(s). Your comments should therefore be as complete and detailed as possible and contain clear views about strengths, weaknesses, relevance, and importance to the field.

Specific comments that cite manuscript sections, pages, paragraphs, or lines are very helpful. All reviews are expected to support the author(s), either in revising the paper, and/or in their future work. Therefore, comments should be respectful and constructive, and suggestions should be offered to enhance the manuscript. Below is a list of questions you may wish to consider:

- Is the topic of the manuscript appropriate for *IJRUME* and likely to be of significant interest to its readers?
- Is the title accurate and sufficiently descriptive of the content?
- Is the abstract accurate and sufficiently descriptive of the content?
- Is the purpose or objective clearly stated?
- If a manuscript is based on data, are the methods of data collection and data analysis appropriate and sound?
- Are the conclusions supported by the data presented?
- Are the tables and figures well-designed and do they add insight into the text? Is any of the information in the tables and figures redundant?
- Are the references cited the most appropriate to support the manuscript?
- Could / should the manuscript be shortened? If yes, how?

Reviewers should not:

- contact authors to discuss a manuscript;
- reveal, cite, or in any way disclose information about a manuscript prior to publication;
- agree to review a manuscript if there is an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Potential conflicts can be discussed with the Editors. It is permissible to seek the assistance of your colleagues to review a manuscript. The name(s) of additional reviewer(s) should be provided to the Editors.

The Editors of *IJRUME* will arrive at a decision about each paper, based on the recommendations of the reviewers, and on their own judgement.

You are asked to make a recommendation to the editors and this must be one of:

1. Accept
2. Minor revisions
3. Major revisions
4. Reject

Notes on 1-4

Accept. The paper proceeds to publication with only a few formal corrections.

Minor revisions. The author is required to attend to specified minor aspects of the paper that would improve it, by an agreed deadline. The Editors check that they are satisfied with the revisions, and the paper then normally proceeds to publication.

Major revisions. This indicates that the paper has some potential, and could well be improved so that it is acceptable after substantial revision. The author is required to attend to several specified and significant aspects of the paper and to do so by an agreed deadline. The revised paper is sent to the three original reviewers, where possible, for a second review. This review focuses on the extent to which the author has addressed the requirements set out in the Editors' decision letter, and whether the paper is now publishable in *IJRUME*.

Reject. The paper is rejected either with no encouragement to the author to resubmit or with some advice to the author and the Editors that *IJRUME* may wish to welcome a substantially rewritten paper on the original topic. The advice to the authors in this case should be about what shortcomings would need to be addressed in the new manuscript. We note that any subsequent resubmission is treated as a new paper.