

Instructions for Referees 2011

General

All articles submitted for publication in the *Interdisciplinary Toxicology* are independently refereed regardless of source. Manuscripts should be assessed on their scientific integrity and the significance of their contribution to knowledge. The author's opinions should be allowed to stand provided they are consistent with available evidence, even though you may disagree with them.

A detailed checklist is provided to guide the review process. Please complete all sections of this and return it with a separately detailed critique of the manuscript. Where appropriate provide an introductory paragraph summarizing the major findings of the article with your overall impression of the paper, and highlighting the major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments, which may be divided into major and minor points.

You are not required to correct deficiencies of style, syntax, or grammar, but any help you can provide in clarifying meaning will be appreciated.

If you recommend that the article be rejected, please give specific reasons for your decision. The final decision concerning acceptability of a manuscript is the responsibility of the Editor.

Confidentiality

Manuscripts sent for review are privileged communications and must remain strictly confidential at all times. Referees must not copy, share or disclose the content of manuscripts to any other person except with the permission of the Editor, and must return or destroy manuscripts after submitting their reports. Referees must not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests.

Conflict of Interest

Referees must disclose to the Editor any conflicts of interest or competing financial interests that could bias their opinions of the manuscript, and should disqualify themselves if they believe this to be appropriate. Competing financial interests include any financial holdings, professional affiliations, advisory positions, board memberships, or patent applications/holdings that may bear relationship to the submitted work. Please indicate on the "Checklist for Referees" whether conflicts do or do not exist and detail these separately as appropriate in your correspondence to the Editor.

Authors are required to state all sources of funding and financial support pertaining to the submitted research, including support in kind in the Acknowledgements section of the manuscript. They are also required to list the organizational affiliations of all authors including academic, corporate and other commercial affiliations that have any bearing on the study in the Acknowledgements section, or included in affiliations listed for each author as footnotes on the title page.

Anonymity

Referees shall remain anonymous, unless both the referee and the Editor agree otherwise.

Classes of articles

Review Articles provide expert summaries of current knowledge in a particular field. Review articles have no set format, but should generally contain an Abstract that clearly summarizes key points, a concise conclusion, Acknowledgements and References.

Original Articles report new and substantial contributions to toxicology/pharmacology science based on original research. They have the format: Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Acknowledgements and References.

Case Reports describe novel observations from clinical practice. The format may include Abstract, Introduction, Case History, Clinical Findings, Discussion, Acknowledgements and References.

Short Communications are vehicles for valuable but limited or preliminary observations. They generally have the same format as *Original Articles*.

Rapid Communications may be preliminary in nature, and report information of pressing importance. At the discretion of the Editorial Board, these will be published as soon as possible following peer review and should follow the format of *Original Articles*.

Aims

The aims, objectives or hypotheses tested should be clearly stated in the Abstract and at the end of the Introduction.

Materials and Methods

The following must be clearly described

Selection of subjects: For experiments or field trials, the source and number of subjects (animals, groups, patients) in the study, the process for their selection and specific criteria for inclusion/exclusion. Procedures used to determine sample size should be described, preferably considering both study power and level of statistical significance in relation to anticipated biological outcomes.

Allocation to treatments: The method of randomization used to allocate subjects to treatment groups must be described. If stratification, blocking, or matching are involved, these should be clearly described and considered in the analysis and presentation of results.

Selection of analytical methods: All methods and procedures used in a research study or experiment should be appropriately described and provide detailed information on the equipment, materials, chemicals and variables. This section should provide enough information to allow other researchers to replicate experiment or study.

Surveys. Study design (retrospective, cross-sectional, etc.), definition of target and sample populations, sampling methods used, and evidence that the sample population is representative of the target population must be indicated. A copy of the questionnaire should be provided.

Statistical Analysis

Analytical methods: should be appropriate for the study design, and the unit of analysis (e.g. individual animal, group or pen, farm, etc) and outcome variables stated unambiguously. When several analytical methods are used, it should be clearly stated where each method was applied. Two-sided tests should be used unless a strong argument is presented to justify a one-sided test. Complex procedures should be explained in detail or referenced. Software packages used should be identified by name, version and supplier, e.g. SPSS version 9.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc, Chicago IL, USA).

Presentation

All items referred to in Materials and methods should be presented in Results and *vice versa*.

References

All articles cited in the text must be included in the References list and vice versa. Abstracts should not be cited as references. The use of "unpublished data" or "personal communications" is only permitted if these exist in written form, and these may be referred to in the text, but must not appear in the reference list. References to papers which have been accepted but not published should be cited as "in press", whereas papers which have been submitted but not accepted should be referred to as "unpublished data". Self-referencing to non-peer-reviewed sources is strongly discouraged.

Referees are asked to scrutinize the use of non-peer-reviewed references and make recommendations regarding their acceptability, and to suggest more appropriate references if these exist.

Manuscript review checklist for referees

Manuscript Nr.:

Title:

Sent Date:

Due Date for Review:

	Excellent	Adequate	Need revision	Unacceptable
A. INTRODUCTION TO THE MANUSCRIPT				
1. Rationale for Study (need and significance)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Research Question Identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Literature Reviewed Organized and Focused	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. METHOD SECTION				
1. Description and Rationale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Data Collection Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Data Analysis (Description of Statistical Evaluation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. RESULTS/DISCUSSION				
1. Evidence of Depth and Detail in Narrative of the findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Descriptive Quality of Figures and Tables (if relevant)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Findings Compared and Contrasted with Relevant Literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Conclusions Drawn Logically	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. MANUSCRIPT COMPONENTS				
1. Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Appropriateness of Title	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. References	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. COMPOSITION				
1. Writing Style	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Grammar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Citation Format (Compliance with Journal Format)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. RECOMMENDATION				
1. Accept as it is	<input type="checkbox"/>			
2. Accept after minor revisions	<input type="checkbox"/>			
3. Accept after major revisions	<input type="checkbox"/>			
4. Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>			
				<input type="checkbox"/> please give specific reasons for your decision

Please make explicit here the basis of the evaluation comments and final recommendation. Please, try to comment on specific issues that the author(s) can address directly.