

SHC Instruction for Reviewers

Shanghai Chest (SHC) aims to provide a service to authors and the research community by making as much research available as possible, provided it meets SHC's high standards of research conduct and ethical procedure and is approved after peer review.

Open peer review

SHC uses fully blind peer review, meaning that:

- reviewers are required to sign reviews with their name, position and institution
- any competing interests should be declared

Reviewers should contact the editorial office confidentially should the need arise in the case of, for example, a concern over a matter of publication ethics.

The role of reviewers

If we need your help with appraising a manuscript, we will email you and ask you to accept or decline the invitation through our submission site.

We ask reviewers to help us to ensure that any studies published in *SHC* were conducted properly, are scientifically credible, reported according to the appropriate guidelines (e.g. CONSORT for clinical trials) and ethical.

The editorial team is responsible for the final decision to accept or reject a manuscript, based on the reviewers' comments.

We welcome feedback from our reviewers. If you have any comments, either on a manuscript you have reviewed or our decision on it or on our review process in general, we would be pleased to hear from you.

To become a *SHC* reviewer

If you would like to volunteer, please register at: <http://shc.amegroups.com/login?source=%2Freviewer>. This process will automatically add your name, contact details and expertise to our database of reviewers. Please let us know once you have registered.

Guidance for peer reviewers

All unpublished manuscripts are confidential

documents. If we invite you to review an article and you choose to discuss the manuscript with a colleague, please remind them of the confidential nature of the paper and acknowledge their input in your review. Please also encourage colleagues to register as reviewers.

SHC uses a blind form of peer review, meaning that authors will not know who has reviewed their work.

If you have any serious concerns about a manuscript from a publication ethics perspective - for example if you believe you have encountered a case of plagiarism - you can contact the editorial office in confidence.

Writing your review

When you provide your review via our online editorial office please declare any competing interest that might relate to the article. These should be personal, professional or financial competing interests relevant to the paper being reviewed.

Before writing your review you may find it helpful to browse our instructions for authors, available [here](#).

We ask authors to provide article summaries and to upload appropriate reporting statements - these should aid in the reviewing process.

We do not need you to comment on the work's importance to general readers. Please consider it for scientific reliability and ethical conduct. A review form will be sent to you when you accept the invitation to review a specific article.

All submitted manuscripts are reviewed initially by a *SHC* editor. Manuscripts are evaluated according to the following criteria: material is original and timely, writing is clear, study methods are appropriate, data are valid, conclusions are reasonable and supported by the data, information is important, and topic has general medical interest. From these basic criteria, the editors assess a paper's eligibility for publication. Other manuscripts are sent to expert consultants for peer review. Peer reviewer identities are kept confidential, but author identities are made known to reviewers. The existence of a manuscript under review is not revealed to anyone other than peer reviewers and editorial staff. Peer reviewers are required to maintain confidentiality about the

manuscripts they review and must not divulge any information about a specific manuscript or its content to any third party without prior permission from the journal editors. Information from submitted manuscripts may be systematically collected and analyzed as part of research to improve the quality of the editorial or peer review

process. Identifying information remains confidential. Final decisions regarding manuscript publication are made within the Editorial Team.

SHC is very grateful to everyone who reviewed for the journal. A full list of our reviewers is available at “Reviewers” in the navigation bars.