

## 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

## Manuscript Evaluation

### Reviewer's Information

E-Mail:	
Title:	
First Name:	
Last Name:	
Affiliation:	
Country:	
Specialization:	

### Manuscript Information

Manuscript Number:	JFVP-.....
Manuscript Title:	

### Evaluation Report

Kindly enter comments per section of the manuscript

General comment:	
Introduction:	
Methodology:	
Results:	
Discussion:	

Bibliography/References:	
Others:	
Decision:	

Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality:	
Contribution To The Field:	
Technical Quality:	
Clarity Of Presentation :	
Depth Of Research:	

### Recommendation

Kindly mark with an X

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject on grounds of (Please be specific)	

**Additional Comments**

Please add any additional comments (including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):