

Guidelines for Reviewers

As with all peer-review journals, it is vital to perform the quality control of reviewing submitted manuscripts. Without the knowledge of specialists, we could not fulfill our mission. We are very grateful to our Reviewers for the time and effort they spend evaluating manuscripts for Nanofabrication.

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

While preparing the reports, we ask our Referees to:

- comment on the originality of the presented work,
- comment on whether the manuscript presents the most recent literature on the topic discussed,
- evaluate the authors' experimental or theoretical approach to the discussed problem(s),
- evaluate the reliability of the results and validity of the conclusions,
- comment on technical aspects of the paper, such as the statistical analyses,
- inform us whether we should consider the manuscript further and what should be done in order to make it publishable (if that is possible),
- describe the significance that the work has for the scientific community.

Please note that accepted papers will undergo language editing by native English speakers. Incorrect grammar, style or punctuation should not constitute sufficient reason to reject a paper if it is still intelligible for the reviewer and its content warrants publication from a scientific point of view.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Please do not distribute copies of the manuscript or use results contained in it without the authors' permission. However, please feel free to show it to knowledgeable colleagues and to consult them about the review. Suggestions for alternative referees are helpful to the editors and would be appreciated.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS

Research Papers - manuscripts submitted to Nanofabrication should:

- contain original work - which is not published elsewhere in any medium by the authors or anyone else,
- be focused on the core aims and scope of the journal,
- be clearly and concisely written - should contain all of the essential components of a scientific paper, should be written in a clear, easy-to-understand manner, and should be brief while still thoroughly explaining methods and results.

Rapid Communications - should meet the standards listed above in addition to reporting new, high-quality work of such importance that it merits urgent publication. Papers chosen to be Rapid Communications will most likely make a significant impact on the current research in animal migration.

If a contribution is not deemed important enough to be chosen as a Rapid Communication, it will be considered as a research paper, possibly after expansion or revision.

Review Articles - should contain the most significant results of the subject under review. All reviews for Bioethanol should be scientifically accurate, should describe the most relevant and recent contributions to the field, should discuss the subject matter competently, and have adequate citations that do not overlook important contributions of other researchers.

TECHNICALITIES

Please provide your report within specified deadline or inform the Editor as soon as possible if you are not able to do so. You can submit your review via Editorial Manager. In case of any problem please contact Editorial Office at nanofabrication.editorial@degruyteropen.com.