

## Peer Review Process

Tucker Publications encourages editors and editorial review boards to refer to the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers for guidance; those guidelines can be found at this link: <https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>.

Peer review refers to reviews provided on manuscript submissions to journals. Tucker Publications uses a double-blind pre-print peer review process in which unmarked manuscripts are delivered to two reviewers for appraisal of the quality of the research document, feedback on elements of the manuscript that could be improved, and a judgment on whether the manuscript is suitable for publication. Peer reviewers and authors are not in direct contact; editors mediate all interactions between reviewers and authors.

Tucker Publications requires a formal process of appointment to the editorial review board, as well as related subject-matter expertise. In order to assign appropriate reviewers, editors must match reviewers with the scope of the content in a manuscript to get the best reviews possible.

A peer review report is completed using a standard template with various fields for the reviewer's commentary and appraisal. Completion and return of the report are required within a stated timeframe. Conflicts of interest are expected to be declared in a timely fashion. The confidentiality of the peer review process is expected to be respected.

The reviewer should appraise and offer feedback on each section of the research manuscript:

- Introduction – well-written, original, topical, research goals
- Materials and Methods – experimental method, reliability of data, best practices
- Results and Discussion – coherent narrative, relevance of data
- Conclusions – reflection upon the research goals
- Supplemental graphical presentations – plausibility, accuracy, and sufficiency of data
- References – accurate, adequate, balanced
- Plagiarism – identified or suspected concerns with evidence

The reviewer's recommendation or rejection of the manuscript is also provided within the template and should be supported with details and examples which support their judgment. All criticism should be provided within a constructive context.