




Academic Open Access Publishing
since 1996



Reviewer Brochure: Comprehensive Reports

“We are sincerely grateful to scholars who dedicate their time to peer-review articles submitted to MDPI journals. Rigorous peer-review is the cornerstone of high-quality academic publishing.”

— The MDPI editorial team.

Last updated on: May 2022

Our complete guidelines for reviewers are available at: [mdpi.com/reviewers](https://www.mdpi.com/reviewers)

The following will provide you with the most relevant instructions and tips regarding the review report.

- Review reports should contain a **brief summary** of the paper, **general concept comments** focused on the scientific content and additional scientific but more **specific comments** focused on the methodology and reproducibility, and any inaccuracies within the text.
- It is crucial that the reviewer reads the whole article as well as the supplementary material (if any). The report should analyse the article as a whole and specific sections or key concepts presented, in a critical way. Please focus on being **detailed and constructive**, ensuring authors can understand your comments so they can address the points you raise. You can provide references as needed, but these must clearly improve the quality of the manuscript under review while avoiding honorary or self-citations recommendations.

General questions to help guide your review report are the following

- Is the manuscript clear, relevant for the field and presented in a well-structured manner? Has a similar paper been published recently?
- Are the cited references mostly recent publications (within the last 5 years) and relevant? Does it include an excessive number of self-citations? Do citations support well the manuscript?
- Is the manuscript scientifically sound and is the experimental design appropriate to test the hypothesis? Is a gap in knowledge identified?

- Are the ethics statements and data availability statements adequate?
- Are the manuscript's results reproducible based on the details given in the methods section?
- Are the figures/tables/images/schemes appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand? Is the data interpreted appropriately and consistently throughout the manuscript?
- Are the conclusions consistent with the evidence and arguments presented? Are there any limitations acknowledged?

→ As a reviewer you will be asked to rate the manuscript in terms of: **Novelty, scope, significance, quality, scientific soundness, interest to the readers, overall merit** and **English level**. Note that MDPI is a signatory of DORA ([sfdora.org](https://www.sfdora.org)). We aim to publish all manuscripts that are scientifically correct, allowing the reader community at large to define impact. We publish both positive and negative results and do not artificially increase journal rejection rates.

→ If the reviewer becomes aware of any scientific misconduct or fraud, plagiarism or any other **unethical behavior** related to the manuscript, they should raise these concerns with the in-house editor immediately.

→ Reviewers should disclose any **conflicts of interest** that may be perceived as bias for or against the paper or authors. The editorial office will check as far as possible before invitation, however we appreciate the cooperation of reviewers in this matter.

→ Reviewers should keep the content of the manuscript **confidential**, including the abstract.

→ Reviewers should provide review reports in a **timely manner**, but please contact the in-house editor if you require an extension to the review deadline.

→ Reviewers should also provide an **overall recommendation** for the publication of the manuscript in each of the reports submitted: Accept in present form, accept after minor revisions, reconsider after major revisions, or reject.

→ Reviewers should be careful not to reveal their **identity** to the authors, either in their comments or in metadata for reports submitted in a document format. Once the reviewer's report is submitted, they will have access to the other reviewers' reports via the online submission system.

- MDPI journals offer the possibility for authors to publish the review reports alongside their paper (**open review reports**) and for reviewers to sign their reports (**open identity**) considering open review is selected by the authors. However, this will only be done at publication and with all parts permission.

- Additional [publishing standards and guidelines](#) are endorsed by the publisher. The reviewer could also add a comment to authors or to the editor in that regards, if considered necessary.

Further guidance on writing a critical review

1. COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. Committee on Publication Ethics. [Available online](#).
2. How to write a peer review for an academic journal: Six steps from start to finish. PhD2published. [Available online](#).
3. How to write a thorough peer review report. Enago Academy. [Available online](#).
4. Web of Science Academy. [Available online](#).

Follow Us



facebook.com/MDPIOpenAccessPublishing



twitter.com/MDPIOpenAccess



linkedin.com/company/mdpi



blog.mdpi.com

MDPI
St. Alban-Anlage 66
CH-4052 Basel
Switzerland
Tel: +41 61 683 77 34

www.mdpi.com



See www.mdpi.com/about for a full list of offices and contact information.

MDPI AG is a company registered in Basel, Switzerland, No. CH-270.3.014.334-3, whose registered office is at St. Alban-Anlage 66, CH-4052 Basel, Switzerland.

Basel, May 2022