

## **Reviewer Guidelines and Expectations for *Neurotherapeutics*®**

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for *Neurotherapeutics*®. The journal publishes high quality articles in fields related to neurotherapeutics, including original research studies and reviews pertinent to the basic neuroscience of neurotherapeutics, therapeutic applications, therapeutic development, and biomarkers.

These instructions are provided to assist you in the review process. You have been invited to serve as a reviewer because of your expertise in the research topic of the submitted article. The editors rely on your expert assessment to ensure that the journal publishes high quality research of significant scientific interest. Your review also assists the authors in improving the presentation of their research. You may make recommendations regarding revision or additional data that must be included before the article is acceptable for publication. Finally, you are responsible for alerting the editors to any ethical concerns or potential inadequacies in the disclosure of authors' competing interests.

### **General Guidelines**

#### *Confidentiality*

- In order to maintain the integrity of the review process, please do not discuss the manuscript you are reviewing with anyone outside the Editorial Office without specific permission from the editor-in-chief.
- You are welcome to solicit input from one or two colleagues in performing the review; this should only be done with explicit permission from the editor-in-chief. In addition, colleagues' (with names) involvement should be mentioned in the Confidential Comments to Editor, once the review is submitted and complete.
- Please do not copy, disseminate, or share information in the manuscript for any purpose, including classroom use, or use it for advancement of your own research.
- Please do not divulge to the authors that you are reviewing the manuscript, even if you need clarifications; those questions should be included in the comments for the authors in the review and will be handled by the Editorial Office.
- When you have completed and submitted your review, please delete or destroy all copies of downloaded or printed manuscript files, as these are the property of the submitting authors.

#### *Deadlines*

*Neurotherapeutics*® is committed to rapid manuscript processing and publication. We request that reviewers complete their reviews by the deadline indicated at invitation. If any difficulties arise that may prevent you from submitting the review on time, please contact the editor-in-chief or guest editors immediately.

#### *Reviewer Competing Interests*

We ask that you reveal any potential competing interest – financial or personal – that may bias your review of the submitted manuscript, including

- any financial interest in the publication or non-publication of the paper;
- a recent or ongoing collaboration with the authors;

- a history of dispute with the authors.

You are not precluded from reviewing the manuscript because you have previously reviewed a version for another journal. However, in the Confidential Comments to the Editor, please note this and let us know whether the authors have improved the manuscript in response to your review elsewhere.

#### *Author Competing Interests*

Please consider any issues of bias that arise based on the content of the paper and the authors' affiliations. Share your concerns with the editors in the Confidential Comments to Editor.

### **Specific Instructions**

The review process differs according to the type of article you are reviewing, either invited review article or unsolicited original research article.

#### *Invited Review Articles*

Topics for review articles for Special Issues are chosen by guest editors and relate specifically to a designated theme. We ask that you consider the following issues when reviewing such papers:

- To what end does the paper serve as a comprehensive review of the topic?
- Does the paper critically evaluate the literature at hand?
- Is the review fair and balanced?
- In addition to considering the authors' own research, does the review adequately discuss work from others in the world's literature?
- Is there any commercial bias in the paper?

Invited reviews typically undergo at least one round of revisions. Thus, in your Comments to Authors make any suggestions you feel would improve the paper. Keep in mind that publication is not guaranteed. In rare situations, invited reviews that fall well below journal standards can be rejected.

#### *Original Research Articles*

*Neurotherapeutics*® strives to publish original articles that would typically fall in the top 10% quality rating of all published papers in the field. Please organize your review into Comments for Authors and Confidential Comments to the Editor.

*Comments to Authors.* Comments to the authors should include an introductory section discussing:

- Suitability of the manuscript for *Neurotherapeutics*® (i.e, is the work relevant to neuroscience with potential application to neurotherapeutics, to neurotherapeutics development, or to the applications of neurotherapeutics?);
- The significance and interest of the paper to *Neurotherapeutics*® readers;
- Importance of the study to the field;

- The originality, novelty and soundness of the methods and analysis;
- Whether the conclusions drawn are justified by the data that is presented;
- Major positive and negative aspects of the manuscript, including major deficiencies or irreparable flaws;
- Clarity of presentation and appropriate use of language (English)

As you review the manuscript, keep in mind that the most helpful reviews briefly state the reasons for your assessments. Such detailed comments will help the editors make an accept-reject decision.

Following the introductory section of your review, please provide specific concerns in a numbered (1, 2, 3, etc.) list with specific page/line numbers where indicated. Numbered comments will facilitate the editors' communication with the authors, the authors' responses, and will serve to guide re-review of the revised manuscript.

As you read the manuscript, consider the following issues and make comments in your review if warranted:

- General presentation: Is the writing concise, clear, and well organized? Do all sections of the manuscript consistently reflect the major point being made? Should the paper or parts of it be shortened or expanded? Are findings new, unique, convincing, interesting?
- Abstract: Does it accurately reflect and summarize the paper?
- Introduction: Is the research question or hypothesis clearly stated?
- Methods and statistical design: Are the methods valid for the question asked? Are they current? Are they clearly presented so that the work can be replicated by other researchers? Are sample sizes adequate? Are the statistical analyses appropriate, correct?
- Results and data: Are they clearly summarized? Are data in the text and tables/figures consistent? Are tables/figures included necessary? Is information needlessly repeated? Can some be placed online-only?
- Discussion: Are the conclusions justified and interpretations sound? Are the limitations of the study noted?
- Citations: Are the cited references pertinent and current? Do they support any assertions of fact not addressed by the data presented in this paper?
- Figures: Are figures of high quality and clearly labeled? Are legends and titles clear?

Do not make a specific statements regarding acceptance or rejection in your comments to the authors. Do not edit the paper for grammar, spelling, etc., although you may comment that these need improvement. Comments should be courteous, constructive and should relate to the manuscript and not to the authors.

#### *Confidential Comments to the Editor*

This section should not duplicate or rehash Comments to Authors. It is used to provide advice regarding acceptance, revision or rejection. Also, it will be helpful to the editors if you provide an assessment of whether the article meets the top 10% quality standard. If you have any concerns regarding a breach of publication or scientific ethics, or the failure to adequately disclose competing interests, please discuss in this section. This section should also be used to

alert the editors to an article that may be controversial and require special consideration before publication.



<http://www.springer.com/journal/13311>

Neurotherapeutics

The Journal of the American Society for Experimental  
NeuroTherapeutics

Editor-in-Chief: Mouradian, M.

ISSN: 1933-7213 (print version)

ISSN: 1878-7479 (electronic version)

Journal no. 13311