

2016. 3. 16. 제정

## 1. General guidelines for peer reviewers

The practice of peer review is to ensure that good science is published. It is an objective process at the heart of good scholarly publishing. Therefore, the referees adopt a positive, impartial, but critical attitude toward the manuscript under review, with the aim of promoting effective, accurate, and relevant scientific communication. The Editor first evaluates all manuscripts. It is rare, but it is entirely feasible for an exceptional manuscript to be accepted at this stage. Those rejected at this stage are insufficiently original, have serious scientific flaws, have poor grammar or English language, or are outside the aims and scope of the Korean Journal of Veterinary Science. Those that meet the minimum criteria are passed on to at least 2 experts for review. The journal employs single blind review, where the reviewer remains anonymous throughout the process.

Please consider the following aspects when reviewing a manuscript:

- Originality
- Organization
- Appropriateness of the approach or experimental design
- Appropriateness of the statistical analyses
- Sound methodology
- Adequacy of experimental techniques
- Soundness of conclusions and interpretation
- Relevance of discussion
- Adherence to the Instructions to Authors
- Significance to the veterinary hygiene and services

Reviewer's recommendations are gratefully received by the editor; however, since editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editor to honor every recommendation. The reviewer will be asked to suggest acceptability as noted on the specific review form (e.g., accept; accept with revision; reject; modify, re-review required; convert to Short-Form).

## 2. Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers

- 1) If the reviewer notices that similar conflicts of interest on his/her part must also be brought to the attention of the editor, subsequently cancel invitation to review the manuscript. If one of the manuscript authors is at reviewer's institution, there could be a perceived conflict of interest, and you should immediately contact the editor so that another individual can be invited to review the manuscript in your place.
- 2) If the reviewer have either a time problem or a conflict of interest, contact the editor for instructions. He/she may extend your deadline or cancel the review assignment as appropriate.
- 3) Do not discuss the paper with its authors either during or after the review process. Although it may seem natural and reasonable to discuss points of difficulty or disagreement directly with an author, especially if you are generally in favor of publication and do not mind revealing your identity, this practice is pro-

hibited because the other reviewers and the editor may have different opinions, and the author may be misled by having “cleared things up” with the reviewer who contacted him/her directly.

- 4) The manuscript provided for review is a privileged document. Please protect it from any form of exploitation. Do not cite a manuscript or refer to the work it describes before it has been published and do not use the information that it contains for the advancement of your own research or in discussions with colleagues. Details of a manuscript and its review must remain confidential, before, during and after publication.
- 5) In reviewer’s comments intended for the author, do not make statements about the acceptability of a paper: suggestions should be stated as such and not expressed as conditions of acceptance. Organize your review in this ways: 1) summarize the major findings of the article as an introductory paragraph, 2) give the reviewer’s overall impression of the paper, and 3) highlight the major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments, which, if appropriate, may be subdivided into major and minor points. Criticism should be presented dispassionately; offensive remarks are not acceptable.
- 6) Reviewer’s confidential remarks directed to the editor should be entered in the box so labeled. Advise the editor of his/her recommendation for acceptance, minor revision, manor revision or rejection by making the appropriate selection in the clickable menu. The final decision regarding revision, acceptance, or rejection of a manuscript rests solely with the editor, so do not state his/her recommendation in the portion of the review that will be sent to the author.
- 7) The reviewer must communicate suspicions of policy or ethics problems directly to the editor, who in turn will contact the editor in chief. Under no circumstance should the reviewer contact the author directly.