

User Guide for Peer Reviewers

This document will guide you through the peer review system on the Dove Medical Press website.

The evaluation form is set out in sections as they appear in the manuscript for research articles, case reports and reviews.

We have provided a checklist with each section for you to consider when reading and as you work through the manuscript please add your comments in the relevant section.

You can find further information on Writing a Peer Review [here](#)

Step 1. Invited Reviews

Please use the link provided in the peer review invitation or go to <https://dovepress.com/login.php> and enter your user name and password to access your peer review interface.

Please select an **Action**:

'Agree to review' **'Decline to review'** **'Unavailable'** **'Not area of expertise'**

The screenshot displays the 'Invited Reviews' section of a user's dashboard. On the left is a navigation menu with options like 'Dashboard', 'Update My Details', and 'Peer Review'. The main content area shows details for an invited review, including the journal name 'Adolescent Health, Medicine and Therapeutics', contact person 'Mrs Walters', and a due date of '10/Dec/2021'. There are four action buttons: 'Agree to Review' (green), 'Decline Review' (orange), 'Unavailable' (orange), and 'Not area of expertise' (orange). A note at the top mentions COVID-19 disruptions. At the bottom, there is a file named '302685-ms.docx' with a 'Download' link.

If you select **'Decline to review'** **'Unavailable'** **'Not area of expertise'** the invitation to peer review will be removed however we would welcome recommendations of another expert reviewer (NB: you may NOT forward this invitation to anyone else, as any recommendations must come via Dove Medical Press). This gives us the ability to check and verify individual peer-reviewers.

If you select **'Agree to review'** move on to **Step 2**

Step 2. Outstanding reviews

This section will show reviews still to be completed.

My Dovepress
Logged in as Mrs Walters

- Dashboard
- Update My Details
- Update My Password
- Manage Email Alerts
- Favored Author Program
- Peer Review**
 - Invited Reviews (0)
 - Outstanding Reviews (1)**
 - Completed Reviews (4)
 - Peer-reviewer acknowledgements (1)
 - Volunteer Reviewer
 - Peer Review FAQ
 - Reviewer Training Programme

Outstanding reviews

Invited Reviews (0) **Outstanding Reviews (1)**

We appreciate due to the disruption caused by the COVID-19 virus that you may have difficulty in meeting the timeline for peer review. Please let us know if you need additional time to complete the review. Our systems will continue to send reminders.

Note: your peer-reviewer comments can only be submitted via the 'Agree to Review' option below. We can not accept your comments within the author's manuscript file(s).

You should consider the [COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#) before accepting to review a paper and throughout the review process

Journal: Adolescent Health, Medicine and Therapeutics

Contact person: Mrs Walters

Title: Title of manuscript goes here

Article type: Original Research

Status: **ACCEPTED TO REVIEW**

Due Date: **10/Dec/2021**

Action: **Review Evaluation Form**

Peer-review comments can only be accepted online via our reviewer evaluation form.

We provide a structured peer review form which guides you through the important points for consideration when evaluating a manuscript. This helps our peer reviewers to write an informed review of the paper to justify their recommendation as to whether it should be accepted for publication.

- o Your peer review should provide an objective critical evaluation on the technical aspects of the paper.
- o Your report must contain a recommendation and a description of your reasons for that recommendation.
- o If you believe the paper needs changes to be made before it is acceptable, please make suggestions on how to improve the paper.
- o We cannot accept downloaded manuscript files that you have annotated or modified in any way.

[Peer review guidelines](#)

Abstract: Abstract will appear here) on... [View more](#)

Keywords: Keywords will appear here . [View more](#)

Files: [302685-ms.docx](#) November 30 2021 14:19:18 [Download](#)

Action: open [Review Evaluation Form](#)

Current Files

Sub ID: 302685

Manuscript title: Title of manuscript goes here

Article type: Original Research

Journal: Adolescent Health, Medicine and Therapeutics

Contact person: Mrs Walters

Submitted on: 30 Nov 2021

Number of authors: 1

Video file links: Video file links will appear here

Files:

[302685-ms.docx](#) November 30 2021 14:19:18 [Download](#)

Research Articles

Title & Abstract

1. Do the title and abstract cover the main aspect of the work?

Title

- Does it express clearly what the manuscript is about?
- Does it highlight the importance of the study?
- Does it contain any unnecessary description?

Abstract

- Is it a short and clear summary of the aims, key methods, important findings and conclusions?
- Does it include enough information to stand alone?
- Does it contain unnecessary information?

If the author has included a Plain Language Summary you will be asked to complete the following -

Plain Language Summary

2. Plain language summaries are beneficial to improve public engagement with science and medical research.

Does the summary:

Explain why the study was done, what the research did and found, what the results mean?

Yes No

Communicate the facts in an interesting way without exaggerating the story?

Yes No

Use short and clear sentences, avoiding jargon and complex words?

Yes No

Use the active voice rather than the passive voice?

Yes No

Use sentences phrased in a positive manner rather than negatively?

Yes No

Use person-centred language rather than focussing on the condition/illness or disability.

Yes No

Further comments

please add any further comments here

Introduction

3. Does the introduction provide background and information relevant to the study?

- Does it clearly summarize the current state of the topic?
- Does it address the limitations of current knowledge in this field?
- Does it clearly explain why the study was necessary?
- Does it clearly define the aim of the study and is this consistent with the rest of the manuscript?
- Is the research question clear and appropriate?

Material and Methods

4. Are the methods clear and replicable? Do all the results presented match the methods described?

- Are the study design and methods appropriate for the research question?
- Is there enough detail to repeat the experiments?
- Is it clear how samples were collected or how participants were recruited?
- Is there any potential bias in the sample or in the recruitment of participants?
- Are the correct controls/ validation included?
- Are any potential confounding factors considered?
- Has any randomization been done correctly?
- Is the time-frame of the study sufficient to see outcomes?
- Is there sufficient power and appropriate statistics?
- Do you have any ethical concerns?

Results

5. If relevant are the results novel? Does the study provide an advance in the field? Is the data plausible?

- Are the results presented clearly and accurately?
- Do the results presented match the methods?
- Have all the relevant data been included?
- Is there any risk of patients or participants being identified?
- Is the data described in the text consistent with the data in the figures and tables?

Peer Review of Non-Research Articles

Many of the same questions will be relevant to all articles. However, for case reports and review articles which do not present original research are unlikely to have a methods section and results but may be more focused on the discussion of a topic.

Case presented

4. Is the subject novel?

Patient anonymity protected and consent obtained?

Has the manuscript or study raised any ethical concerns?

- Does the diagnosis appear to be correct?
- Was the treatment reasonable for the diagnosis?
- Are the treatment and outcomes clearly described?
- As far as possible, is the patient anonymous?
- Are the conclusions reasonable and not attempting to generalize to wider population?

Review

3. Does the review present an unbiased summary of the current understanding of the topic?

Does the manuscript present a balanced view of recent work by active groups in the subject area?

Does the review make a valuable contribution to the field?

- Is there any content which has been previously presented in a review?
- Does it focus on recent advances in research?
- Is it a balanced and unbiased overview of current understanding?
- Are any recent or important references missing?
- Is it too focused on the author's own research?
- Is the interpretation and presentation of results of previous studies accurate and precise?
- Has it a valuable contribution to the research field?
- Is it understandable for non-expert readers?

Discussion

6. Do the findings described by the author correlate with the results? Are the findings relevant?

- Do the authors logically explain the findings?
- Do the authors compare the findings with current findings in the research field?
- Are the implications of the findings for future research and potential applications discussed?
- Are any limitations of the study discussed?
- Are any contradictory data discussed?

Conclusion

4. Does the conclusion provide a clear summary of the main points?

Does it present the significance of these points?

- Provide a clear summary of the main points
- Present the significance of these points
- Are the conclusions supported by the data presented?

Figures & Tables

6. If the author has provided figures and tables are the figures and tables clear and legible? Are the figures free from unnecessary modification?

- Is the data presented in a clear and appropriate manner?
- Is the presentation of tables and figures consistent with the description in text?
- Do the figure legends and table headings clearly explain what is shown?
- Do the figures and tables include measures of uncertainty, such as standard error or confidence intervals, where required as well as the sample size?
- Do you have any concerns about the manipulation of data?

Please refer to our editorial policies for guidelines on [image integrity and manipulation](#). If you have any concerns about duplication or manipulation of images, please provide detail in the box above

If the author has included video files this section will be labelled Figures/ Tables and Video review comments can be add here.

All video abstract / transcript submitted by pharmaceutical companies must be peer reviewed. This section will only appear if a video abstract / transcript has been submitted

Video Abstract/Transcript

7. Does the video:

- Introduce the article, highlight the main results and conclusions and discuss future potential developments in the field as a result of the work.
- Is the presentation understandable and accessible to users outside of the immediate field of the article?
- Includes additional relevant material such as animations and lab footage is encouraged. Please check if any figures/animations are subject to copyright and, if so, ensure you have permissions to use these in your video.

Please explain your decision.

7. Does the paper raise any concerns?

Has the manuscript or study raised any ethical concerns?

Is the statistical analysis appropriate to the research?

Are the references relevant to the study and in the correct style?

Do you have concerns regarding similarities to other articles published by the same authors i.e. redundancy or salami-slicing? Other concerns?

Please refer to our [editorial policies](#) for guidelines on [research ethics and consent](#), plagiarism, duplicate submission, text-recycling/self-plagiarism, authorship and data falsification/fabrication, [reference style](#)

Please add any concerns not already addressed in the above sections. Please **do not** copy and paste text already mentioned in above sections in this box.

Competing interest

9. Do any of the authors' competing interests raise concerns about the validity of the study i.e. have the authors' competing interests created a bias in the reporting of the results and conclusions?

[View conflict of interest disclosure from authors](#)

Recommendations to the Editor

10. Recommendations to Editors

- Outstanding** - Paper is well written and a significant contribution to the literature. No improvement needed.
- Excellent** - Accept after discretionary revisions.
- Very good** - Some minor revisions needed.
- Good** - Several minor revisions needed.
- Satisfactory** - Paper requires multiple minor revisions, but I commend this paper to the Editor-in-Chief.
- Fair** - One major revision and several minor revisions needed.
- Poor** - Some major revisions needed with multiple minor revisions required.
- Very poor** - Major revisions needed to improve scientific validity and/or clarity.
- Flawed** - The manuscript has major flaws that cannot be improved with revisions. Rejection without option to resubmit recommended.

11. Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

- Yes No

Additional comments (If you have any further comments to make, please add them here)

This is an optional box to add any further comments for the author(s) not already addressed in the above sections. Please **do not** copy and paste text already mentioned in above sections in this box.

Confidential comments for Editor (Confidential comments for the Editor-in-Chief only)

This is an optional box to add any confidential comments. Only the Editor-in-Chief will see these comments.

Competing Interest Disclosure (Please check the boxes as appropriate)

- I have no relevant financial interests or conflicts related to this manuscript.
- I certify that all my affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity having a financial interest in or conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript have been disclosed.

NB: "Financial involvement" includes:

Employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, royalties. For more information, please consult our advice on [competing interests](#)

Peer Reviewer Competing Interest Disclosure

Declaration

Details of relevant conflicts of interests must be declared in the "Conflicts of Interest" box when submitting your peer review comments.

Disqualification

If you feel your conflicts of interest prevent you from conducting an unbiased review, you should disqualify yourself from reviewing the manuscript and inform the editorial office of this fact.

Confidentiality clause

All papers submitted to Dove Medical Press are to be kept confidential. Peer-reviewers, Editors-in-Chief, Associate Editors and Dove Medical Press staff should not disclose, discuss, or provide any part or aspect of such papers until such time as they are published. Rejected papers may not be discussed, disclosed or provided to any third parties. By acting as an invited reviewer, Editor-in-Chief, or Associate Editor you agree to be bound by these restrictions.

Display my name in the 2021 peer reviewer list

- Yes No

Save as Draft

Save and Print

Submit Review

When you have completed all sections please click on the button marked **Submit Review** this will automatically send your review comments to the editorial team.

After completing your peer review, you may click **Logout** in the top right of the website.

If you have any concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our editorial team on the following email ed@dovepress.com.