



Reviewer Guidelines for Manuscript Review

Purpose of the Review

The reviewer's role is to assess the scientific quality, originality, methodological rigor, clinical relevance, and clarity of the manuscript, and to provide constructive feedback to assist both the authors and the editor.

General Principles

1. Maintain confidentiality of all manuscript content.
2. Declare any conflicts of interest before accepting the review.
3. Remain objective, respectful, and constructive.
4. Focus on improving the manuscript rather than rewriting it.
5. Base all comments on evidence and scientific reasoning.

Use of Microsoft Word Review Tools

1. Track Changes must be enabled for any suggested text modifications.
2. Scientific, methodological, and editorial observations should be inserted using Comments rather than editing the text directly.
3. Comments should be clear, concise, and numbered where appropriate.
4. Major concerns should be identified through comments placed at the relevant section of the manuscript.
5. Minor corrections (grammar, spelling, formatting, terminology) should be proposed using Track Changes.
6. Reviewers should avoid accepting or rejecting changes made by others; all modifications should remain visible to the authors and editors.
7. The reviewed manuscript should be returned with Track Changes visible and all comments retained.

How to Enable Track Changes in Word

- Open the manuscript in Microsoft Word.
- Go to the Review tab.
- Select Track Changes and ensure it is activated before starting the review.
- Use New Comment to insert observations and recommendations.

Review Process

Step 1: Initial Assessment

Evaluate:

- Originality and novelty of the work.
- Relevance to the journal's readership.



- Ethical considerations.
- Overall scientific quality.

Step 2: Detailed Review

A. Title and Abstract

Assess whether:

- The title accurately reflects the study.
- The abstract summarizes objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.
- Key findings are clearly presented.

B. Introduction

Assess whether:

- The research question is clearly stated.
- The rationale is justified by current literature.
- The objectives are clearly defined.

C. Methods

Assess whether:

- Study design is appropriate.
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria are clearly described.
- Sample size is justified.
- Statistical methods are appropriate and adequately described.
- Ethical approval and informed consent are reported when applicable.
- Methods are sufficiently detailed to allow replication.

D. Results

Assess whether:

- Results are presented clearly and logically.
- Tables and figures are appropriate and accurate.
- Data support the findings reported.
- Statistical analyses are correctly reported.

E. Discussion

Assess whether:

- Findings are interpreted appropriately.
- Results are compared with existing literature.
- Limitations are acknowledged.
- Conclusions are supported by the data.

F. References

Assess whether:

- References are relevant and current.



EUROPEAN UNION OF
MEDICAL SPECIALISTS

The advocate of medical specialists

- Key literature has been cited appropriately.
- Citations are accurate and complete.

Comments to Authors

Major Comments

List significant scientific concerns that must be addressed.

Minor Comments

List smaller issues such as wording, formatting, or clarification requests.

Comments to the Editor (Confidential)

Provide:

- Overall assessment of scientific quality.
- Novelty and importance.
- Any ethical concerns.
- Recommendation regarding publication.

Recommendation

Select one of the following:

- Accept
- Minor Revision
- Major Revision
- Reject

The recommendation should be consistent with the comments provided in the review.