



Guidelines For Reviewers

The primary purpose of this review is to provide the editors with the information needed to reach a decision. The review should also instruct the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable. As far as possible, a negative review should explain to the authors the weaknesses of their manuscript, so that rejected authors can understand the basis for the decision and see in broad terms what needs to be done to improve the manuscript for publication elsewhere. This is secondary to the other functions, however, and you should not feel obliged to provide detailed, constructive advice to authors of papers that do not meet the criteria for SJoP. If you believe that a manuscript would not be suitable for publication, your report to the author should be as brief as is consistent with enabling the author to understand the reason for the decision.

Confidential comments to the editor are welcome, but it is helpful if the main points are stated in the comments for transmission to the authors.

The ideal review should answer the following questions:

- Who will be interested in reading the paper, and why?
- What are the main claims of the paper and how significant are they?
- How does the paper stand out from others in its field?
- Is the manuscript clearly written? If not, how could it be made more clear or accessible to non-specialists?
- Could the manuscript be shortened / lengthened?
- Have the authors done themselves justice without overselling their claims?
- Have they been fair in their treatment of previous literature?
- Are the claims novel? Are the claims convincing? If not, what further evidence is needed?
- Are there other references, methods or work that would strengthen the paper further?
- How much would further work improve it, and how difficult would this be? Would it take a long time?
- Are the claims appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature?
- If the manuscript is unacceptable but promising, what specific work is needed to make it acceptable?

We strongly encourage you to write and save the main text of your review in Word or a similar program, then paste it into the form once you have finished. All communications regarding this manuscript are privileged. Any conflict of interest, suspicion of duplicate publication, fabrication of data or plagiarism must immediately be reported to the editors.

Thank you for agreeing to review this paper.