

Peer-review process

All manuscripts that are submitted for publication in JMAB are double-blind peer reviewed.

Journal has an obligation to provide transparent policies for peer review, and reviewers have an obligation to conduct reviews in an ethical and accountable manner. Clear communication between the journal and the reviewers is essential to facilitate consistent, fair and timely review.

Journal allows reviewers to provide confidential comments to the editor as well as comments to be read by the authors. The journal may also ask for a recommendation to accept/revise/reject; any recommendation should be congruent with the comments provided in the review.

Reviewers' responsibilities

The peer reviewers comment on the quality and rigour of the work they receive. If the work is not clear because of missing analyses, the reviewers should comment and explain what additional analyses would clarify the work submitted. It is not the job of the reviewers to extend the work beyond its current scope. They have to be clear which (if any) suggested additional investigations are essential to support claims made in the manuscript under consideration and which will just strengthen or extend the work.

The reviewers have to:

- ✓ Contribute to the decision-making process, and to assist in improving the quality of the published paper by reviewing the manuscript objectively, in a timely manner;
- ✓ Maintain the confidentiality of any information supplied by the editor or author;
- ✓ Alert the editor to any published or submitted content that is substantially similar to that under review;
- ✓ Be aware of any potential conflicts of interest (financial, institutional, collaborative or other relationships between the reviewer and author) and to alert the editor to these, if necessary withdrawing their services for that manuscript;
- ✓ Contact the journal if anything relevant comes to light after they have submitted their review reports that might affect the original feedback and recommendations;
- ✓ Continue to respect the confidential nature of the review process and do not reveal details of the manuscript after peer review unless they have permission from the author and the journal;
- ✓ Not intentionally prolong the review process, either by delaying the submission of the review report or by requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or author.