

Instructions for reviewers procedure

The Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition uses a peer review process; all submissions to the journal are sent to a fellow student active in the same research field. The purpose of reviewing is to provide your professional opinion on an article within your field of interests, and to provide the authors explicit feedback on how to improve their manuscript for publication. In this way, reviewers advise the editorial board on whether to accept articles, possibly after minor or major revision, or to reject articles reviewed.

If you would like to review, please contact the editorial board at journal@neuroscience-cognition.org. To select the appropriate reviewer for each manuscript, please inform us about your main area of expertise and the subjects you are interested in.

Confidentiality and anonymity

The review process is anonymous and confidential. This implies that the reviewers are unfamiliar with the identity of the author(s), and that they should adopt a respectful attitude towards the manuscript open for revision. The reviewers are not allowed to share any content, nor consult colleagues without first contacting the editorial board. On the other hand, the anonymity of the reviewers is also preserved throughout and beyond the peer review process.

Procedure

As a reviewer, you receive the article in a MS Word.doc format, enabling you to correct and comment within the document by using the “track changes” mode. The goal is 1) to provide comments and to raise questions or other remarks based on the content of the article, 2) to correct grammatical errors and unclear sentences, and 3) to fill in the reviewers’ form. Herein, you give a summary of the article, indicate concisely and clearly, its strengths and weaknesses, and you give recommendations that in your opinion will improve the manuscript. In this way, your final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of the article will be supported.

Format

Currently, the Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition accepts articles in three different categories: research articles, review articles, and methodology articles. Guidelines for the different formats can be found on the journal’s website on the “Submission for authors” page: journal.neuroscience-cognition.org/submission-for-authors. A short overview of each of these formats is given in the table below.

Article type	Description	Includes	Maximum length*
<i>Research article</i>	Research articles give readers a clear and concise presentation of the main results obtained and the methodology employed during original research performed by the author(s).	Title, authors with institutional affiliations, abstract, mini-abstract, keywords, introduction, methods, results, discussion, figures and references.	7.000 words

<i>Review article</i>	Review articles give a coherent and complete overview on current findings concerned with a certain topic within a specific academic field.	Title, authors with institutional affiliations, abstract, mini-abstract, keywords, introduction, general discussion and conclusion, figures and references.	10.000 words
<i>Methodology article</i>	Methodology articles should present new advances in a method, test or procedure relevant to systematic review and evidence synthesis.	Title, authors with institutional affiliations, abstract, mini-abstract, keywords, introduction, methods, results, discussion, figures and references.	400 words

* Including figure and table descriptions and in-text citations, but excluding the reference list.

Checklist to assess the quality of the article:

Title

- ◆ Is the title clear and compact (between 90-150 characters), and does it convey the main message article?

Abstract

- ◆ Is the abstract a concise, clear, and comprehensive summary of the main text of the paper?
- ◆ Is the content (data, conclusions, etc.) consistent with that presented in the main text?

Introduction

- ◆ Does the introduction succinctly state what is known and unknown about the topic?
- ◆ Are any important findings from previous studies omitted or misrepresented?
- ◆ Is the functional, biological, and/or clinical significance of the topic established?
- ◆ Is the specific experimental question, goal, or aim to be addressed stated?
- ◆ Are previous experimental observations linked together to establish a formally stated and testable working hypothesis / thesis statement? And does it clearly indicate the direction of the postulated effect?

Methods

- ◆ Are the subjects adequately described (i.e., do you know everything you need to for proper interpretation of the results)?
- ◆ Is the subject population appropriate for the question posed and sufficiently large to provide the necessary statistical power?
- ◆ Was the assignment of subjects to conditions randomized?
- ◆ Was the study conducted blindly?
- ◆ Are proper control groups and/or conditions included?
- ◆ Does the experimental design allow the hypothesis to be tested in a rigorous scientific manner? Is there a better experimental approach that could have been employed?
- ◆ Was each methodology described in sufficient detail for others to repeat the study? If not, do the authors provide a proper (i.e., peer reviewed) reference that would provide such details?

- ◆ Are the measurement techniques used sufficiently reliable, precise, and valid?
- ◆ Is the rationale for making each measurement either obvious or explained?
- ◆ Have the data been analyzed in the most appropriate manner?
- ◆ Is it clear how the data will be interpreted to either support or refute the hypotheses?

Results

- ◆ Are the data reported in a clear, concise, and well-organised manner?
- ◆ Have tables, figures, and text (the 3 tools used to present data) been used effectively?
- ◆ Do they provide supporting and additional information to the text (i.e. are they needed)?
- ◆ Are data presented on any measurement that was not described in the Methods? Alternatively, are the data on all measurements described in the Methods presented?
- ◆ Have the data been presented in the appropriate units (e.g., absolute unit changes vs. percentage changes) or properly adjusted statistically (e.g., when there are differences in the baseline values of variables that could confound interpretation of the results)? Have standard deviations/standard error of the means been included for each variable?
- ◆ Is the scaling of the figures appropriate and unbiased?
- ◆ Does the data seem reasonable from a physiological perspective?

Discussion

- ◆ Are the major new findings of the study clearly described and properly emphasised?
- ◆ Are the key conclusions adequately supported by the experimental data?
- ◆ Is there any other way to interpret and/or explain the data other than that suggested by the authors?
- ◆ Is the significance of the present results described? Is it clear how the findings extend previous knowledge in a meaningful way?
- ◆ Are important experimental observations from previous reports described in the context of the present results?
- ◆ Do the authors support their statements with appropriate references?
- ◆ Do the authors discuss their data in a manner that provides insight beyond that presented in previous sections?
- ◆ Are the unique aspects and other experimental strengths of the study properly highlighted?
- ◆ Are the important experimental limitations of the study described so that the reader will be able to interpret the findings appropriately?
- ◆ Do the authors make suggestions as to how the results of their study need to be extended in the future to learn more about the issue in question?

General

- ◆ Is the article readable for every student within the Master Neuroscience and Cognition? (i.e. are key concepts first properly explained?)
- ◆ Is the article relevant and of interest to the audience?
- ◆ Is the article written in correct British English?
- ◆ Correct use of abbreviations (only standard abbreviations are allowed) and nomenclature?
- ◆ References: Are the references according to the *American Psychological Association (APA)* style?
- ◆ Does the article comply with the appropriate requirements as stated in the author's guidelines?

Judgement

- ◆ **Accept:** The article meets all the requirements for the Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition.
- ◆ **Accept with minor revision:** The article needs several minor adjustments without having to change large bodies of text and/or graphics before it meets the requirements for the Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition.
- ◆ **Accept with major revision:** The article needs one or several major adjustments of large bodies of text and/or graphics before it meets the requirements for the Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition.
- ◆ **Reject:** The article would need a complete rewrite in order to meet the requirements for the Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition.

For further reading on the reviewing process, we would like to suggest the following articles:

- ◆ Benos, D.J., Kirk, K.L., and Hall, J.E. (2003). How to Review a Paper. *Advances in physiology education*, 27(2), 47-52.
- ◆ Hoppin, Jr., F.G. (2002). How I Review an Original Scientific Article. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*, 166 (8), 1019-1023.
- ◆ Seals, D.R., Tanaka, H. (2000). Manuscript peer review: a helpful checklist for students and novice referees. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 23 (1), 52-58.

General information

All guidelines and forms are provided on the website of the Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition and can be downloaded as PDF files (journal.neuroscience-cognition.org).

The logo for the Journal of Neuroscience and Cognition. It features the word "JOURNAL" in a bold, black, sans-serif font. Below it is a thick horizontal line. Underneath the line, the letters "N&C" are written in a very large, bold, black, sans-serif font.