

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

Overview. The review process is an important stage of the publication process of a manuscript. It helps an Editor (or Editorial board) in making decision on a manuscript and also enables the author(s) to improve the manuscript.

Reviewer selection is a compulsory procedure to maintain the high peer review standard of the journal. Many factors are considered during peer reviewer selection as: proof of expertise in terms of published papers within the same area in prominent journals, affiliation and reputation, specific suggestions, etc. *Chemistry Journal of Moldova* tries to avoid reviewers who are slow, careless, or do not provide sufficient justification for their decision (positive or negative).

Chemistry Journal of Moldova follows the single blind peer-review procedure for all submitted manuscripts. The identity of the reviewers is not disclosed to the authors of the manuscript, but their views are forwarded by the Editor to the author(s) for consideration.

Before accepting to review a manuscript, reviewers should ensure that:

- (i) the manuscript is within their area of expertise;

Note: If you are unable to review, we would be grateful if you could suggest an alternative referee.

- (ii) have sufficient time to accomplish a critical review of the manuscript.

Note: If you are able to review the manuscript but require more time to prepare a Report we can agree to consider an extension; please contact the Editor to request this.

Conflict of interest. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated to the paper.

Confidentiality. Each manuscript received for review must be treated as a confidential document. Reviewers must ensure that the review processes is confidential. Reviewers must not contact the authors directly without the permission of the journal. Details of the manuscript and the review process must remain confidential during and after the review process. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal benefits.

Plagiarism. *Chemistry Journal of Moldova* strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. If the reviewers suspect any unethical practice in the manuscript, they are kindly asked to write it in the report with some proof/web links. Studies which are carried out to reconfirm/replicate the results of any previously published paper with new data-set, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a “clear declaration” of this matter.

Reviewers should identify relevant published papers that have not been cited by the author(s). Also, to alert the Editor to any published or submitted content that is substantially similar to that under review.

Chemistry Journal of Moldova publishing ethics:

Chemistry Journal of Moldova aims to publish original research manuscripts of high quality. Submission of the manuscript to this journal indicates that the research results have not been published anywhere or not been submitted elsewhere for publication. If author(s) are using any part of published paper (in English or any other language), a proper references or in any case, if required a permission from the previous publisher or copyright holder (whichever is suitable) are mandatory.

Fairness. Reviewers should be honest and objective. Reviewers should not be influenced by:

- the origin of the manuscript;
- religious, political or cultural viewpoint of the author(s);
- gender, race, ethnicity or citizenship of the author(s).

Acknowledgement. The reviewer will receive an acknowledgement e-mail when the Editor receives the Report on the original or revised manuscript. If the reviewer requires a formal confirmation of his (her) service as a referee, the reviewer should contact the Editor.

REVIEW REPORT The *Report form* includes the quality assessment section, the question section, the recommendation section and the comments/suggestion section.

The reviewer is asked to rate the quality of the manuscript out of 5 (where 1 is the lowest score and 5 is the highest) on four aspects:

- Quality
- Originality
- General interest
- Practical utility.

Written comments. Comments of the reviewer should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach an Editorial decision. The following key points related to scientific quality and presentation should be taken in consideration (and not only):

- Is this manuscript scientifically rigorous, accurate and correct?
- Is the research relevant and novel, adding significantly to scientific knowledge already published?
- Is the bibliography sufficiently critical, current, and internationally evaluated?
- Is the English used of scientific level?

Note: The English language in submitted manuscripts to *Chemistry Journal of Moldova* must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. It is the author(s) responsibility to improve the English quality (if required) by any other third party service.

- Is the *Title* adequate and appropriate?
- Does the *Abstract* properly cover the contents of the manuscript?
- Are the *Keywords* suitable so that the article can be found in the current registers or indexes?
- The *Introduction* should inform why the problem is important, how the hypotheses and current knowledge relate to the problem, what the theoretical and experimental implications are, and how the study relates to the previous research in the area.
- The procedures described in *Experimental part* should be detailed and inform of each step in the completing of the research; the sampling design should be named and described; validity and reliability of the selected instruments should be described.
- *Results and discussion:* 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Are the tables and figures clear and essential, and captions informative? Tables and figures should follow appropriate format and style. 3. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 4. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts (data, figures, tables).
- Have the *Conclusions* been justified sufficiently?

Please address general and specific comments that should be relevant to the type of manuscript submitted and will help the author(s) to improve their manuscript.

Chemistry Journal of Moldova welcomes three types of manuscripts:

Short communication should describe preliminary results of an investigation and for their significance are due to rapid communication.

Research paper should describe original research in chemistry of high quality and timelines. Experimental work should be accompanied by full experimental details.

Review paper is a specially commissioned review of research results of topical importance.

Recommendation. Reviewer's recommendation about the manuscript publication should be either:

- Yes (accept without any modifications);
- Yes, with minor additions/corrections (as specified in comments to the author(s));
- Yes, with major revisions (for the reasons given in comments);
Note: If major revisions are required, the manuscript should be rejected and the author(s) asked to resubmit as a new one after its revision.
- No, (reject for the reason given in comments).

Recommendation should be backed with constructive arguments and facts based on the content of the manuscript.

Revision stage. Depending on the recommendation and reviewer's comments, the Editor may invite the reviewer to review the revised manuscript. When reporting on a revision, the reviewer should read the author(s) replay to his (her) comments and check the changes in the revised manuscript, then decide if the revision is now suitable for publication.

Resources

COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. <http://publicationethics.org/>

Chemistry Journal of Moldova. Ethical Standards and Procedures. <http://www.cjm.asm.md/>

Chemistry Journal of Moldova. Instructions for Authors. <http://www.cjm.asm.md/>