

GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Peer review process is a crucially important procedure to guarantee the academic quality of the journal. Therefore, peer reviewers are sincerely acknowledged and respected.

GENERAL POLICY

A qualified peer reviewer should send his/her feedback (even decline to review due to some reasons) as per the time frame of the journal. All peer reviewers must maintain a strict and perpetual confidentiality for the content of all manuscripts under their review and for any related correspondences with BPG and/or the journal editorial team. Reviewers must not share any part of the manuscript with a third party or discuss its content with the authors of the manuscript or any other person. Reviewers must not plagiarize or cite any of the contents of a manuscript before the manuscript has been formally published. Reviewers will decline participation in the peer review process for any manuscript if a conflict of interest exists, including interests related to the manuscript's authors, personal interests, or academic or economic interests. If a conflict of interest becomes apparent during the peer review process, the reviewer must inform the Editorial Office immediately.

MAJOR POINTS TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE COMMENTS

(1) The importance of the research and the significance of the research findings; (2) The novelty and innovative nature of the research; (3) The quality of the manuscript's presentation and readability; (4) The ethics-related aspects of the research; (5) If the research is reasonably designed and supported; (6) Language evaluation: if the article should be re-polished before publication.

SPECIFIC POINTS TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE COMMENTS

Title: (1) Do the main and short titles accurately reflect the major topic and content of the study?

Abstract: (1) Does the abstract provide a clear delineation between the research background, objectives, materials and methods, results (including important data), and conclusions?

(2) Does the abstract present the innovative and significant points related to the background,

objectives, materials and methods, results (including important data), and conclusions?

Materials and Methods: (1) Are the materials and methods sufficiently described for the results and conclusions that are presented in the preceding sections? For example: Is the sample size defined? Is the study type and design defined (e.g. multicenter case-control study)? Are all sample subsets detailed (i.e. samples with special features, such as those from different cells or tissues or patients with distinguishing conditions)?

(2) Are the methods advanced and/or applied in an innovative way?

(3) Are sufficiently detailed descriptions provided for modified or novel methods used in the study, which will allow other investigators to reproduce or validate the study?

(4) Is the study design and use of controls rational and reliable?

(5) Are the statistical methods used appropriate?

Results: (1) Do the results provide sufficient experimental evidence or data to draw firm scientific conclusions?

(2) Are the sample size and statistical data $\frac{3}{4}$ especially graphical data that reflect the results $\frac{3}{4}$ adequate for a clinical study?

Discussion: (1) Is the section well organized?

(2) Are the conclusions drawn appropriately supported by the literature? If not, are reasoned explanations provided?

(3) Does the section describe findings based upon systematic theoretical analyses of the results and provide valuable conclusions, while not merely repeating the data presented in the Results section?

References: (1) Are the references appropriate, relevant, and up-to-date?

Tables and Figures: (1) Do the tables and/or figures reflect the major findings of the study?

(2) Are the tables and/or figures designed to present the maximal amount of information in the most concise and clear manner?

REASONS FOR REJECTION OF AN ARTICLE

The following reasons are adequate, alone or in combination, for rejection of a manuscript for publication: (1) The scientific content does not correspond to the journal's aims and scope; (2) The

research is not reasonably designed and the data are inadequate to support proper explanations or conclusions; (3) Related work has been previously published and only a few new points have been added; (4) The article contains accumulated information that has been previously published, with only few technical improvements; (5) The article is expected to attract only a very small portion of the journal's readership audience; (6) The article has been rejected previously and resubmitted without adding any new valuable content.