

# FOUNDATIONS OF COMPUTING AND DECISION SCIENCES

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

### **Accepting to Review a Manuscript**

Reviewers should not accept to review a manuscript if:

1. A conflict of interest exists between the reviewer and the author(s), their institutions, or their funding sources.
2. The reviewer is currently collaborating with (any of) the author(s) or has collaborated with the author(s) within the past 2 years.
3. The reviewer feels he/she cannot give an impartial and objective review, free from professional or personal bias.

If you have questions regarding a potential conflict of interest, please contact the editor and he will decide whether it is appropriate for you to review the manuscript.

If a conflict of interest does not exist, please consider whether you can complete the review within the time specified in the invitation letter (usually 5 or 6 weeks).

### **Peer Review Process**

If you realize that a conflict of interest exists after you have already accepted to review the manuscript, please notify the editor immediately, so another reviewer can be found.

If you are unable to complete your review within the allotted time due to unforeseen circumstances, please contact the editorial office immediately so that arrangements can be made for the review to be completed in a timely fashion.

### ***Ethical Responsibilities During the Review Process***

1. Confidentiality – The reviewer should maintain confidentiality about the existence and substance of the manuscript. It is inappropriate to share the manuscript or to discuss it in detail with others before publication.
2. Reviewer Conduct – Knowledge of the content of manuscripts reviewed should not be used for any other purpose unrelated to the reviewing of the manuscript.
3. Reporting Concerns – Each manuscript is checked against plagiarism, and other forms of ghostwriting or guest authorship before being sent to the reviewers, nevertheless the reviewer also has the responsibility of noting any ethical concerns he/she identifies and reporting them to the editor. Look out for excessive fragmentation of results to achieve multiple publications or attempts to submit/publish similar material more than once, at least by examining the references.

### ***Constructing a Review***

1. Rating the manuscript – In this section of the review form, the reviewer ranks the (i) Novelty/Originality, (ii) Mathematical and formal correctness, (iii) Clarity, (iv) Compactness, (v) Quality of presentation, and (vi) Completeness of references of the manuscript based on a 10-point scale (10 being the best). Please note that manuscripts are normally limited to 28 journal pages. Exceptions can be made in special cases only with the concurrence of the referees and the editors.

2. Comments for the Authors – In this section the reviewer should discuss, in a constructive and helpful way, the shortcomings and/or strengths of a study. Please include some comments on your judgment of originality and scientific importance of findings, adequacy and length of the title, adequacy of the abstract, introduction, rationale and clarity of hypothesis, adequacy of experimental design and methods, quality of data and presentation of results (including figures and charts), appropriateness of the authors' interpretation of their data, length and appropriateness of the discussion, and inclusion of recent and appropriate references. If possible, make specific recommendations for revisions. Even if your recommendation is to reject the manuscript, it is still appropriate to provide recommendations on how it could be improved.

3. Final recommendation – The reviewer also makes a recommendation for publication of the manuscript by choosing one of the following options: (i) To accept without further modifications – chosen sometimes when refereeing a revised version of a previously refereed manuscript, (ii) To accept subject to minor modifications – in which case the manuscript will not be sent back to the reviewer after being revised by the author(s) but assessed by the editor based on the available reviews, (iii) To accept subject to major modifications – in which case the revised manuscript will be sent back to the reviewer for another assessment, or (iv) To reject. Please note that each manuscript is being assessed by at least two independent reviewers with expertise in the topical field, whose identities remain unknown to the author(s) and other reviewers. The final decision regarding modification, acceptance, or rejection of the manuscript rests solely with the editor.

4. Confidential comments to the Editor – In this (optional) section the reviewer may provide specific comments regarding the original aspects of the work and its importance, or indicate whether he/she has any concerns regarding the statistical analysis used. Any ethical considerations should also be stated here.

### ***Follow-up***

It is recommended that you keep a copy of the review for further reference. The manuscript may be returned to you for a second review, particularly when major modifications were suggested. In addition, if the manuscript is resubmitted after rejection, the new version may be sent to you for review. In either case, you will need to evaluate the author's responses to your original criticisms.