

# MM Science Journal

## Guidance for reviewers

**MM Science Journal is the peer-reviewed open-accessed journal.**

In order to protect the reviewers identity, every reviewer has its own ID number, that represents his/her in all communication toward the author(s). The ID number is unique and it is strictly recommended, not to communicate its ID to anyone else.

To protect the authors identity during the reviewing process, MM Science Journal doesn't communicate the author(s) name either. The author(s) are revealed when publishing.

### Guidance to Reviewers

- Reviewers should be conducted objectively.
- Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.
- Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments and references as necessary and not be defamatory or libellous.
- Reviewers should declare any competing interests.
- Reviewers should decline to review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.
- Reviewers should respect the confidentiality of material supplies to them and should not discuss unpublished manuscripts with colleagues or use the information in their own work.
- If a reviewer wants to pass a review request onto a colleague, they should get the editor's permission beforehand.

The reviewers are kindly asked to address ethical aspects (if find) of the submission such as:

- Has the author published this research before?
- Has the author plagiarised another publication?
- Is the research ethical and have the appropriate approvals/consent been obtained?
- Is there any indication that the data has been fabricated or inappropriately manipulated?
- Have the authors declared all relevant competing interests?

The reviewers assess the paper manuscripts against the following criteria:

- Topicality and significance.
- Novelty and degree of contribution to present knowledge.
- Quality of discourse and conclusions.
- Contribution to innovation and competitiveness in practice
- Quality of description and validation of contributions.
- Quality of references.
- Formal quality.

Reviewers should evaluate manuscripts critically but constructively to prepare detailed comments about the research and the manuscript to help authors improve their work.

Reviewers are asked to make one of four recommendations:

acceptable as it is, acceptable with minor revision, acceptable with major revision, not acceptable.

The review process is expected to be complete within 4-6 weeks, but unpredictable events as conflicting recommendations may cause some delay.