

The Journal of Nutrition and Food Sciences

Guidelines for Reviewers

Summary

Peer reviewers play a pivotal role in upholding the integrity of scholarly research within the domain of nutrition and food sciences. Their participation hinges on trust and ethical conduct, essential for maintaining the quality of published work. However, reviewers may enter this role without clear guidance on their ethical responsibilities. Thus, it is incumbent upon journals to establish transparent peer review policies, while reviewers must uphold ethical standards in their assessments.

Communication between journals and reviewers is crucial for ensuring consistent, fair, and timely evaluations. The Journal of Nutrition and Food Sciences guidelines aim to offer valuable insights to researchers, serve as a reference for editors and publishers in guiding reviewers, and act as an educational tool for institutions training their scholars.

In the context of these guidelines, peer review encompasses evaluations of manuscript submissions to the journal under an ethical framework remains consistent across various materials, but the review process may differ based on the nature of the material.

Peer review process

This journal adopts a double-anonymous peer review model, striving to pair reviewers' expertise with submitted manuscripts. Reviews are expected to demonstrate thoughtful engagement, provide constructive feedback, and contribute to the advancement of knowledge in nutrition and food sciences

Mission

The primary aim of the peer review process is to ensure the quality and integrity of scholarly publications and research through a rigorous evaluation process. Its mission is centered on attaining excellence by maintaining high standards in the dissemination of knowledge and scientific inquiry. Through thorough examination and constructive feedback, peer review serves as a mechanism to uphold the credibility and reliability of academic work, thereby fostering advancements in various fields of study.

Vision

Our platform brings together diverse professionals, each adding their unique perspective to advance knowledge and innovation. Through inclusivity, we nurture creativity, driving us towards new discoveries in the field.

Values

The journal of nutrition and food sciences places a high value on embracing diverse perspectives within the field. We greatly appreciate reviewers who provide critical yet constructive feedback to authors, fostering an environment aimed at enhancing the quality of research and scholarly discourse. Our pool of reviewers is carefully selected to represent a variety of organizations, and professions ensuring a comprehensive and inclusive evaluation process that reflects the breadth and depth of expertise in nutrition and food sciences worldwide.

Ethics

All communication related to invitations to review, abstracts, manuscripts, and reviews must remain confidential. Reviewers are expected not to disclose their reviews or any information regarding the review process without prior consent from the editors and authors involved, even after publication. This confidentiality extends to any comments provided by other reviewers to the authors, which are shared with you during the decision-making process.

Before you review

Upon receiving an email inviting you to review for an original research, review, meta-analysis or case report etc you will have the option to accept or decline. Before making your decision, consider the following:

Time Commitment

Journal editors seek thorough and specific reviews. If you are uncertain about your capacity to deliver at that level, you can suggest a colleague who might have more availability. If you are interested in reviewing but currently busy, inform the editor and express your willingness to review at a later time.

Expertise Match

The editor may not be familiar with the intricacies of your work, so assess whether you have the expertise required for the review. Keep your ORCID account updated with relevant keywords and institutional details to assist editors in matching you with suitable papers.

Deadlines

When a request is made for a review, it is advisable to acknowledge promptly, even if you are undecided to accept. The timeframe for the review will vary and the editorial office will provide you with the specific deadline upon invitation.

Conflict of Interest

Reviewers must carefully assess whether they have any conflicts of interest that could compromise the impartiality of their review. It is essential to decline the invitation to review if any of the following situations apply:

- Have a close personal relationship (spouse or family member) or professional connection (past or present PhD students and postdocs) with any of the authors.
- Have financial interests related to or impacted by the manuscript under review or its topic.
- Feel unable to maintain objectivity.

If the reviewer believes they can remain objective despite a potential conflict of interest, they should promptly inform the editor or editorial office upon receiving the review invitation.

Additionally, reviewers must uphold unbiased standards, disregarding factors such as nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender, or any other characteristics of the authors, as well as the origin of the manuscript or commercial considerations. These principles ensure the integrity and fairness of the peer review process in scholarly publications.

Responding to your review request

Upon receipt of your review request via email, you have the option to either accept or decline it.

Ethics

As a reviewer, your primary responsibility lies in evaluating the scientific content and validity of manuscripts. However, your expertise places you in a prime position to identify instances of fraud, plagiarism, or potential defamation/libel within the text. Should you notice any such ethical concerns, whether intentional or accidental, it is imperative to promptly notify the journal office. By maintaining the highest ethical standards, you contribute to safeguarding the integrity and credibility of the scientific literature. For further insights into the various ethical challenges you may encounter, we encourage you to consult our research and publication ethics guidelines page. Your diligence and adherence to ethical principles are integral to maintaining the trustworthiness of scholarly research.

Originality

When evaluating the manuscript, consider whether it introduces novel and compelling insights to the field. Assess whether it contributes to the existing body of knowledge and addresses an important research question. Compare the manuscript to highly-cited or downloaded papers in the field to gauge its significance. Tools like Web of Science or Scopus can aid in this comparison. This ensures a comprehensive understanding of the existing literature and helps contextualize the manuscript's contributions. By addressing these aspects, reviewers play a crucial role in ensuring the relevance and impact of published research.

Layout and format

Authors are expected to adhere closely to the manuscript presentation instructions outlined in each author's guidelines of the journal. If deviations from these guidelines are observed and the editor has not addressed them in the review invitation, it is important to bring this to the attention of the editor or highlight it in your review report. By flagging formatting issues and providing feedback, reviewers contribute to the overall quality and professionalism of the published work.

Title

Is the article clearly outlined and does it incorporate key keywords effectively? (Think about how you typically search for research articles.) Does it effectively convey the importance of the research and is the content coherent?

Structured abstract

Have all essential fields within the manuscript been duly filled out? Does the abstract aptly encapsulate the substantive content and findings of the article?

Introduction

Does the manuscript effectively outline the author's intended objectives and articulate the research question with clarity? Has the author provided a comprehensive overview of existing research literature to contextualize the study? Is it evident how this study either challenges existing knowledge or contributes to it? Are there any significant works that have been overlooked?

Methodology

Does the author provide an accurate description of the data collection process? Is the study design appropriate for addressing the research question posed? Does the article delineate the procedures followed in conducting the study? If novel methods are employed, are they

elucidated sufficiently? Is there adequate information provided for replication of the research? Was the sampling methodology appropriate for the study objectives? Are the equipment and materials utilized adequately described? Does the article clearly specify the type of data collected, with precise descriptions of measurements?

Statistics

It is important to meticulously review the analysis match with the objectives and errors frequently encountered.

Results

This section is where the author should elucidate their findings. Are the results presented in a clear and understandable manner? It is crucial to evaluate the quality and relevance of the author's analysis.

Conclusion/discussion

Are the assertions made in this section logical and backed by the results obtained? Do the findings align with the author's initial hypotheses? Do the conclusions effectively integrate the various components of the paper? Does the study support or challenge existing theories? Has the author articulated how the research contributes to the existing body of knowledge?

Graphics and tables

Please review any included figures and tables and provide suggestions for enhancements if possible. Do these visual elements effectively communicate information to the reader? Are they integral to understanding the narrative? Do the figures accurately represent the data? Are they consistently presented, following the same format throughout the paper?

Language

If the clarity of the author's argument is compromised by poor English usage, it is imperative to highlight this in the review report. This approach aims to enhance the overall quality of the manuscript by ensuring clear and effective communication of scientific ideas.

Implications for research

Does the paper effectively bridge the gap between theoretical concepts and practical applications? How can the research findings be applied across various domains?

- In practice: What are the economic and commercial implications of implementing the research findings?
- In teaching: How can the research findings be integrated into educational curricula to enhance learning outcomes?
- To influence public policy: How can the research findings inform policy decisions and shape governmental initiatives?
- In research: Does the research contribute meaningfully to the existing body of knowledge in the field?
- For society: Is the research influencing public attitudes or contributing to improvements in quality of life?

It is essential to evaluate whether these implications align cohesively with the findings and conclusions presented in the paper. This ensures that the practical implications are grounded in the empirical evidence and logical reasoning presented within the study.

Quality of communication

Is the paper effectively communicated, considering the technical language of the field and the presumed knowledge the audience of the journal? Has the clarity of expression and readability been addressed, including sentence structure, use of jargon, and acronyms? It is crucial to evaluate whether the paper is accessible and comprehensible to the intended readership, ensuring that complex concepts are conveyed in a clear and understandable manner.

Reviewer reports and recommendations

Reviewers are tasked with evaluating several key aspects of the manuscript. This includes assessing the importance of the paper and novelty compared to existing literature, determining if the methods, data, and analysis adequately support the conclusions, evaluating the reproducibility of the study, and identifying any ethical concerns. Additionally, reviewers are encouraged to provide feedback on scholarly presentation improvements, such as clarity, grammar, appropriateness of language, logical structure, and quality of display items.

A well-rounded review should cover the following points:

- **Summary:** Provide a brief overview of the paper's topic, contextualize the findings within the existing literature, and assess the overall significance and quality of the work.
- **Major issues:** Identify any significant flaws in the technological, design, or interpretation aspects of the study, discuss the impact of these flaws on the findings, and evaluate the novelty of the research compared to prior work. Address whether the current results support or challenge earlier findings and propose necessary revisions if major flaws are identified.

- Minor issues: Address any areas of ambiguity, factual errors, or issues with references, numerical data, or visual aids. May avoid focusing on formatting concerns and prioritize specific, constructive feedback.

A comprehensive review should offer a balanced critique, highlighting both strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript, and providing specific recommendations for improvement.