

## Guidelines for Reviewers

---

Peer review represents a vital element of maintaining high standards in scholarly publishing. This process could not be managed without the knowledge and experience of contributing specialists. We are very grateful to all our reviewers for the time and effort they spend evaluating manuscripts for *Open Health*.

### General expectations

The journal uses a closed single-blind peer review system (the names of the reviewers are hidden from the authors). Submitted manuscripts are reviewed by two or more experts. Reviewers are asked to recommend whether a manuscript should be accepted, revised or rejected. Although the journal uses the plagiarism detection system [CrossCheck](#), reviewers should alert the editors if they suspect any issues relating to author misconduct such as plagiarism.

Reviewers are asked to provide detailed, constructive comments that will help both the editors make a decision on the publication and the author(s) to improve their manuscript. They should point out whether the work has serious flaws that preclude its publication, or whether additional experiments should be carried out or additional data should be collected to support the conclusions drawn.

Reviewers invited by the editors of the journal should reveal any potential conflict of interest they may have with respect to the manuscript or the authors. All likely personal, professional or financial conflicts of interest should be considered.

### Specific expectations

When preparing the reports, we ask our reviewers to consider the following points:

#### **Originality and significance of presented work**

Reviewers are asked to comment on the originality and significance of the work for the scientific community. If the presented research is unoriginal and similar work has been published previously, reviewers should give references.

#### **Experimental or theoretical approach to the discussed problem(s)**

Reviewers are asked to discuss the novelty of theoretical approaches and experimental methods presented in the manuscript.

#### **Strengths and weaknesses of the methods used**

Reviewers should assess the appropriateness of the methods used. If necessary, technical aspects of the paper, such as the statistical analyses, should be commented. They should suggest improvements that will result in the enhancement of the quality of the paper.

#### **Reliability of the results and validity of the conclusions**

Reviewers are requested to comment on the reliability of new methods developed. They should consider whether the conclusion(s) drawn are supported by the data collected.

#### **Organization of the manuscript**

Reviewers should comment whether the manuscript is easy to read and the arguments are described in a logical and understandable way. They should suggest improvements, if necessary.

#### **Discussion of the most relevant literature on the topic**

Reviewers should comment on the relevance of literature cited in the manuscript. They should give reference to any important research not mentioned in the paper.

#### **Revisions**

When revision of the manuscript is suggested, reviewers are asked to recommend which aspects of the work should be improved: better motivation for the research, additional data to confirm conclusions, better organization of the paper.

Please note that accepted papers will undergo language editing. Incorrect grammar, style or punctuation should not constitute a 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.

### **Research data and Data Availability Statements**

Journal's data sharing policy requires the authors to place Data Availability Statement (DAS) as a separate section between the Acknowledgments and References. DASs should include information on where data supporting the results reported in the article can be found including, where applicable, hyperlinks to publicly archived datasets analyzed or generated during the study. Where research data are not publicly available, this must be stated in the manuscript along with any conditions for accessing the data.

Peer reviewers are encouraged to check the manuscript's Data Availability Statement. Where applicable, they should consider if the authors have complied with the journal's policy on the availability of research data, and whether reasonable effort has been made to make the data that support the findings of the study available for replication or reuse by other researchers. Peer reviewers are entitled to request access to underlying data (and code) when needed for them to perform their evaluation of a manuscript.

### **Confidentiality**

Reviewers are asked not to distribute copies of the manuscript or use results contained in it without the authors' permission. However, they are free to show it to knowledgeable colleagues and to consult them about the review. Suggestions for alternative reviewers are helpful to the Editors and would be appreciated.

### **Technicalities**

We ask reviewers to return their reports within the specified deadline or inform the Editor as soon as possible if they are not able to do so. Reviewer reports can be submitted via online submission system.