

PEER-REVIEW GUIDELINES

ILUMINACE

The Responsibility of the Peer Reviewer

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in their specialty field, and then providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their submission. It is appropriate for the Peer Reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript.

Before Reviewing

Please consider the following:

- **Does the article you are being asked to review match your expertise?**
If you receive a manuscript that covers a topic that does not sufficiently match your area of expertise, please notify the editor as soon as possible. Please feel free to recommend an alternate reviewer.
- **Are there any potential conflicts of interests?**
While conflicts of interest will not disqualify you from reviewing the manuscript, it is important to disclose all conflicts of interest to the editors before reviewing. If you have any questions about potential conflicts of interests, please do not hesitate to contact the receiving editorial office.

The Review

When writing a review, please keep the following in mind:

- Discuss article originality and contribution to current scholarship and science. Acknowledge strengths and weaknesses of study design and methodology.
- Discuss the author's interpretation of results.
- Comment on manuscript writing, organization, and tables and figures.
- Supply evidence and references (within text and in literature) to substantiate critical comments.
- Give a clear recommendation, with constructive comments in a courteous tone.

- Categorize your final decision:

1. **ACCEPT** Publish as is (with cosmetic issues representing the only issues) – this is quite unusual, and it means that the essay submitted is, barring the odd grammatical point and typo, of the standard you would expect to encounter in a peer-reviewed journal.

2. **ACCEPT WITH REVISIONS** Publish following satisfactory completion of mandatory revisions (these will relate to localized points of clarity, additional information being added, structure being revised, passages being redrafted). This means that the essay is basically there but needs to be polished and tweaked a little bit. It is a more common outcome than a straight accept.

3. **REJECT** Not suitable for publication. By this is meant that the essay, in terms of its argumentation, contribution, rigor, execution, and/or (in this instance) relevance to the topic of the collection, is unlikely to reach the standard of a peer-reviewed journal.

- If relevant, identify clearly the revisions which should be made – in the form of additions, removals, development of points or rephrasing.

Final Comments

- All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party.
- Ethical Issues:
 - Plagiarism: If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, please let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible
 - Fraud: It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor.
- Your recommendation regarding an article will be strongly considered when the editors make the final decision, and your thorough, honest feedback will be much appreciated.
- Please never hesitate to contact the editorial office with any questions or concerns you may have.