# COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere

Peer reviewers should:

* only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner
* respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal
* not use information obtained during the peer-review process for their own or any other person’s or organization’s advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others
* declare all potential conflicting of interests, seeking advice from the journal if they are unsure whether something constitutes a relevant interest
* not allow their reviews to be influenced by the origins of a manuscript, by the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, or by commercial considerations
* be objective and constructive in their reviews, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libellous or derogatory personal comments
* acknowledge that peer review is largely a reciprocal endeavour and undertake to carry out their fair share of reviewing and in a timely manner
* provide journals with personal and professional information that is accurate and a true representation of their expertise
* recognize that impersonation of another individual during the review process is considered serious misconduct

kindly read the complete Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers is available at COPE’s website <http://publicationethics.org/files/Peer%20review%20guidelines.pdf>

We sincerely thank you for taking time to evaluate the attached manuscript
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**Evaluation Report**

Kindly enter comments per section of the manuscript
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| Bibliography/References: |  |
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