Reviewer Guidelines

Sciedu Press

Purpose: These guidelines set the standard for peer reviewers working with Sciedu Press journals. They support fair, rigorous, and confidential review, consistent with COPE and accepted journal-publishing practice. Journal-specific instructions and editorial judgement still apply.

Contents

1. Scope, Authority, and Core Principles
2. The Purpose of Peer Review and the Reviewer’s Role
3. Reviewer Eligibility and Professional Responsibility
4. Before Accepting a Review Invitation
5. Conflicts of Interest and Competing Interests
6. Confidentiality, Intellectual Property, and Data Protection
7. Anonymity and Peer Review Models
8. Independence, Objectivity, Respect, and Inclusion
9. Co-reviewing, Mentoring, and Assistance from Others
10. Use of Artificial Intelligence and Automated Tools
11. Recommended Review Workflow
12. Core Evaluation Criteria
13. Article-Type and Discipline-Specific Considerations
14. Reporting Guidelines, Transparency, and Reproducibility
15. Research Ethics and Research-Integrity Concerns
16. Citation Practices and Requests for Additional References
17. Preparing the Review Report
18. Editorial Recommendations and Decision Categories
19. Reviewing Revised Manuscripts
20. Timeliness, Extensions, and Withdrawal from Review
21. Communication with Editors and Authors
22. Reviewer Misconduct and Breaches of these Guidelines
23. Reviewer Recognition and Record Keeping

1. Scope, Authority, and Core Principles

These guidelines apply to reviews of manuscripts, revisions, registered reports, protocols, data papers, review articles, special-issue submissions, and other scholarly content submitted to Sciedu Press journals. Follow any stricter journal, discipline, or legal requirement.

Reviewers should follow five core principles:

- **Integrity.** Conduct the review honestly, independently, and in good faith.
- **Competence.** Accept assignments only when the manuscript is sufficiently within the reviewer's expertise.
- **Confidentiality.** Protect the manuscript, review materials, author information, and editorial correspondence.
- **Fairness.** Evaluate scholarly merit without personal, commercial, ideological, institutional, or discriminatory bias.
- **Accountability.** Provide a reasoned, timely report and disclose any limitation, conflict, assistance, or permitted tool use that could affect the review.

Reviewer recommendations are advisory. The editor makes the final decision after considering the reports, journal scope, research quality, ethics, and any specialist advice.

2. The Purpose of Peer Review and the Reviewer's Role

Peer review helps editors judge a manuscript and helps authors strengthen it. Its main purposes are to:

- help editors determine whether a manuscript is suitable, valid, original, ethical, and sufficiently important for publication;
- identify material errors, unsupported claims, methodological weaknesses, reporting omissions, and ethical concerns;
- help authors improve the accuracy, clarity, transparency, and scholarly contribution of their work;
- protect the reliability of the scholarly record; and
- support consistent editorial standards across manuscripts and issues.

Review the manuscript as submitted. Do not act as the author's supervisor, copyeditor, competitor, advocate, or adversary. Separate essential revisions from personal preferences, and do not demand a different study simply because you would have designed it differently.

Judge the work on its merits. Negative, confirmatory, local, or unfashionable findings are not grounds for rejection when the question is valid, the method is sound, and the conclusions follow from the evidence.

3. Reviewer Eligibility and Professional Responsibility

Reviewers are chosen for relevant subject, methodological, or professional expertise.

A reviewer should:

- provide accurate and current affiliation, contact, expertise, and researcher-identifier information;
- not impersonate another person, delegate the review without permission, or permit another person to submit a report under the reviewer's identity;
- accept only assignments for which the reviewer can provide a meaningful and responsible evaluation;
- notify the Editor when a manuscript requires expertise outside the reviewer's competence, such as advanced statistics, specialist language knowledge, laboratory methods, legal analysis, or discipline-specific ethics;
- keep reviewer accounts secure and report suspicious invitations, account access, or attempts to influence the review; and

- participate in reviewer training when requested or when unfamiliar with the journal's review model and standards.

Early-career researchers may review when qualified. Mentored co-review requires prior approval and disclosure under Section 9.

4. Before Accepting a Review Invitation

Before accepting, consider the following.

4.1 Expertise

Accept only if you can assess the main question, framework, methods, evidence, and conclusions. If your expertise is partial, tell the editor.

4.2 Availability

Accept only if you can meet the deadline. Otherwise, decline promptly or request an extension before accepting.

4.3 Conflicts and relationships

Check for financial, professional, personal, institutional, intellectual, political, religious, or other interests that may affect, or appear to affect, your judgement. When in doubt, ask the editor.

4.4 Review model and policies

Confirm the journal's review model and read its criteria, data policy, reporting requirements, AI policy, and ethics instructions.

4.5 Declining an invitation

Decline unsuitable invitations promptly. You may suggest qualified alternatives, but not to create reciprocal arrangements or favour close associates. Editors verify all suggestions independently.

5. Conflicts of Interest and Competing Interests

A competing interest is any secondary interest that may affect, or appear to affect, a reviewer's judgement. Disclosure is mandatory; the editor decides whether the review may proceed.

Potential conflicts include, but are not limited to:

- **Financial interests:** employment, consulting, honoraria, grants, patents, investments, stock ownership, litigation, or commercial relationships connected to the manuscript or its conclusions.
- **Recent professional relationships:** recent coauthorship, active collaboration, shared grants, supervisory relationships, mentorship, employment negotiations, or direct competition.
- **Institutional relationships:** current employment at the same institution, department, laboratory, research centre, or closely connected organization as an author.
- **Personal relationships:** family relationships, close friendship, personal hostility, disputes, or other relationships that could affect impartiality.
- **Intellectual commitments:** strongly held theoretical, methodological, political, religious, or advocacy positions that make objective evaluation difficult.
- **Editorial or publication relationships:** involvement with the manuscript at another journal, prior review of a substantially similar version, or a role at a directly competing journal that creates a relevant conflict.
- **Benefit or disadvantage:** circumstances in which publication, delay, or rejection could materially benefit the reviewer or disadvantage a competitor.

Decline if you cannot review independently. Recognizing an author in double-anonymous review does not itself require withdrawal, but disclose any relationship that may affect impartiality.

If a conflict appears after acceptance, stop and contact the editor. Submit a partial report only if asked.

6. Confidentiality, Intellectual Property, and Data Protection

Manuscripts are confidential and may contain unpublished ideas, personal data, proprietary methods, or legally protected material. Protect every file and communication.

Unless expressly authorized by the Editor, reviewers must not:

- share the manuscript, supplementary files, data, review form, editorial correspondence, or review report with any other person;
- discuss the manuscript or its review with colleagues, students, employers, media, authors, or third parties;
- contact the authors directly;
- use unpublished ideas, data, methods, analyses, figures, wording, or conclusions for personal research, teaching, commercial purposes, grant applications, competitive advantage, or any other purpose;
- retain unnecessary copies after the review has concluded;
- post any part of the manuscript or review on a website, social platform, preprint server, repository, or external service; or
- upload manuscript content to translation, grammar, plagiarism, AI, or other third-party tools unless the journal has expressly authorized that specific use and confidentiality can be assured.

Confidentiality continues after the decision and publication. Publication does not disclose reviewer identity, correspondence, earlier drafts, or other confidential material.

If disclosure may be necessary because of misconduct, legal risk, imminent harm, or regulation, contact the editor first. Sciedu Press will decide the appropriate process.

7. Anonymity and Peer Review Models

Follow the journal's stated review model.

- **Single-anonymized review:** the reviewer may know the authors' identities, but the reviewer's identity is not disclosed to the authors unless the journal permits it.
- **Double-anonymized review:** authors and reviewers are not informed of each other's identities during review.
- **Open or transparent review:** identities, reports, author responses, or editorial correspondence may be disclosed or published according to the journal's stated policy and the participants' consent requirements.
- **Post-publication review:** assessment occurs after publication under the platform's rules and moderation policy.

Do not try to identify anonymized authors. If identity becomes apparent, tell the editor when that knowledge creates a conflict or threatens impartiality.

Remove your name and document metadata from returned files when anonymity is required. Sign comments only when the journal permits or requires it.

8. Independence, Objectivity, Respect, and Inclusion

Base the review on scholarly quality and relevance. Personal characteristics, institutional prestige, career stage, language background, nationality, or beliefs must not influence the assessment.

Reviewers should:

- write in a professional, courteous, and specific manner;
- criticize the work rather than the authors;
- avoid sarcasm, ridicule, insults, threats, dismissive language, and unsupported allegations;
- acknowledge strengths as well as limitations;
- distinguish factual errors from legitimate scholarly disagreement;
- avoid imposing a preferred theoretical school, method, citation tradition, or writing style when alternatives are valid;
- give comparable scrutiny to manuscripts regardless of author status or institutional reputation; and
- avoid language-editing criticism that disadvantages authors solely because English is not their first language.

Assess language for clarity and precision, not conformity to your style. Do not copyedit line by line. If language prevents reliable review, explain why and give a few representative examples.

9. Co-reviewing, Mentoring, and Assistance from Others

Do not involve another person without the editor's prior permission. This includes colleagues, trainees, students, statisticians, and translators.

When co-review is approved:

- all participants must be identified to the Editor;
- each participant must disclose competing interests and agree to confidentiality;
- all participants must understand the journal's policies and review model;
- one designated reviewer remains responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and timely submission of the final report; and
- the contribution of the co-reviewer or trainee should be acknowledged in the confidential comments or designated system field.

Mentored review can help train new reviewers, but the invited reviewer must supervise the work. Undisclosed delegation is misconduct.

10. Use of Artificial Intelligence and Automated Tools

Peer review requires human judgement and confidentiality. External AI and automated services may retain or expose manuscript content, and their output may be inaccurate or biased.

Unless the journal gives specific written authorization, reviewers must not:

- upload or paste any part of a manuscript, figure, table, dataset, supplementary file, review form, author response, or editorial correspondence into a generative AI or external automated system;
- use AI to generate the substantive evaluation, recommendation, major comments, or confidential comments;
- rely on AI-generated summaries instead of reading the complete manuscript;
- use an AI-detection score as proof of author misconduct; or
- present AI-generated statements, references, or analyses as the reviewer's own verified judgment.

Where a journal expressly permits limited use of a secure and approved tool, the reviewer must:

- confirm that confidentiality, copyright, data-protection, and retention requirements are satisfied;
- limit use to the authorized purpose;
- independently verify every output;
- remain fully accountable for the review; and
- disclose the tool and nature of use to the Editor when required.

Local tools that do not transmit manuscript content, such as an offline spellchecker, may be used unless the journal prohibits them. If unsure, ask the editorial office before using a tool.

11. Recommended Review Workflow

Use the following workflow.

1. Confirm the journal's scope, article type, review model, deadline, and journal-specific criteria.
2. Read the manuscript once without drafting detailed comments. Identify the research question, main contribution, study design or analytical approach, evidence, and principal conclusions.
3. Assess whether the manuscript is intelligible enough for full review and whether specialist input is needed.
4. Read the manuscript a second time in detail. Record major validity, originality, ethics, reporting, and interpretation issues separately from minor presentation issues.
5. Check whether the conclusions follow from the evidence and whether limitations and alternative interpretations are addressed.
6. Examine tables, figures, appendices, data statements, ethics statements, declarations, and references rather than reviewing only the narrative text.
7. Consider applicable reporting guidelines and discipline-specific standards.
8. Prepare a structured report with a brief summary, major comments, minor comments, and confidential comments to the Editor where necessary.
9. Select the recommendation that best matches the seriousness and correctability of the identified issues.
10. Before submission, verify that comments are clear, respectful, internally consistent, and free of identifying information when anonymity applies.

12. Core Evaluation Criteria

Adapt these criteria to the manuscript type and discipline.

12.1 Fit, significance, and contribution

- Does the manuscript fall within the journal's aims and scope?
- Is the research question, thesis, or problem clearly stated and meaningful?
- Does the work make a sufficiently clear scholarly, methodological, theoretical, educational, professional, or practical contribution?
- Is the importance of the work explained without exaggeration?

12.2 Originality and relationship to prior work

- Is the contribution original in question, evidence, context, interpretation, synthesis, or method?
- Does the manuscript accurately position itself in relation to relevant literature?
- Are claims of novelty proportionate and supported?
- Does the work duplicate, fragment, or substantially overlap prior publication without appropriate disclosure?

12.3 Title, abstract, and keywords

- Does the title accurately identify the topic and, where appropriate, the study design?
- Does the abstract reflect the purpose, methods or approach, principal results or argument, limitations where relevant, and conclusion?
- Are claims in the abstract consistent with the manuscript?
- Are keywords specific, discoverable, and representative?

12.4 Introduction and literature review

- Is the background accurate, current, balanced, and sufficient?
- Are the research gap, rationale, objectives, hypotheses, or guiding questions clear?
- Are competing perspectives and relevant regional or international scholarship considered?

- Does the literature review synthesize rather than merely list sources?
- Are citations used responsibly and without selective distortion?

12.5 Methods, materials, corpus, or analytical approach

- Is the design or analytical approach appropriate to the question?
- Are sampling, participants, data sources, corpus selection, materials, instruments, procedures, variables, coding, interventions, and analytical methods described sufficiently?
- Are inclusion and exclusion criteria justified?
- Are reliability, validity, trustworthiness, reflexivity, triangulation, or robustness addressed as appropriate?
- Could another qualified researcher understand, evaluate, and, where applicable, reproduce or replicate the work?
- Are deviations from protocols or planned analyses disclosed?

12.6 Data, evidence, and statistical analysis

- Are data or evidence adequate for the claims?
- Are statistical methods appropriate and described clearly?
- Are assumptions, uncertainty, effect sizes, confidence intervals, missing data, multiple testing, and sensitivity analyses addressed where relevant?
- Are qualitative interpretations supported by data extracts, coding procedures, or analytic reasoning?
- Are computational methods, software, models, and parameters sufficiently documented?
- Would specialist statistical, methodological, or technical review be advisable?

12.7 Results or findings

- Are findings presented clearly, logically, and without unnecessary duplication?
- Are all prespecified or central outcomes reported?
- Do tables and figures agree with the text?
- Are null, negative, unexpected, or contradictory findings reported rather than omitted?
- Are results distinguished from interpretation?

12.8 Discussion, interpretation, and conclusion

- Are interpretations supported by the evidence?
- Are alternative explanations and relevant counter-evidence considered?
- Are findings compared appropriately with prior scholarship?
- Are limitations, uncertainty, generalizability, transferability, and boundary conditions discussed?
- Does the conclusion answer the stated question without introducing unsupported claims?
- Are practical, policy, educational, or clinical recommendations proportionate to the study?

12.9 Tables, figures, images, and supplementary material

- Are they necessary, legible, accurate, and properly labelled?
- Do captions permit independent interpretation?
- Are units, scales, legends, sample sizes, and statistical indicators clear?
- Is there evidence of inappropriate manipulation, duplication, selective cropping, or inconsistency?
- Are permissions and source acknowledgements provided for reused material?
- Does supplementary material contain information essential to evaluating the work?

12.10 References

- Are key claims supported by appropriate sources?
- Are references relevant, sufficiently current, and reasonably balanced?
- Are primary sources used where appropriate?

- Do cited works appear to exist and support the statements attributed to them?
- Are there signs of fabricated, irrelevant, excessive, or strategically manipulated citations?

12.11 Writing and organization

- Is the manuscript coherent, concise, and logically organized?
- Can the central argument, method, and findings be understood?
- Are terminology and abbreviations defined and used consistently?
- Are revisions needed for clarity rather than merely stylistic preference?

12.12 Declarations and transparency

- Are authorship and acknowledgements appropriately anonymized (removed or masked), and are other relevant statements (funding, competing interests, ethics approval, consent, data availability, code availability, AI-use) present and anonymized where applicable?
- Are trial registration, protocol registration, repository identifiers, or preregistration details provided when required?
- Are limitations on data or material access explained?
- Do the declarations appear consistent with the manuscript?

13. Article-Type and Discipline-Specific Considerations

Apply standards suited to the article type. Examples follow.

13.1 Original empirical research

Check the question, design, data, analysis, ethics, transparency, reproducibility, and whether the conclusions follow from the results.

13.2 Review articles and meta-analyses

Check the review question, search and selection methods, risk-of-bias assessment, synthesis, exclusions, heterogeneity, and whether the conclusions reflect the evidence. Narrative reviews should explain how sources were found and selected.

13.3 Qualitative and mixed-methods research

Check methodological fit, sampling, researcher reflexivity, data generation, analytic transparency, supporting evidence, and integration of qualitative and quantitative components where applicable.

13.4 Humanities, language, literature, and conceptual scholarship

Check the originality and coherence of the thesis; use of primary and secondary sources; accuracy of quotation, translation, and context; theoretical framing; analysis; counterarguments; and whether the conclusion follows. Apply standards appropriate to the discipline.

13.5 Case reports, practice reports, and descriptive studies

Check the case's scholarly or educational value, relevant context, consent and de-identification, accuracy of claims, and whether conclusions stay within the evidence.

13.6 Protocols and registered reports

Check the importance of the question, planned methods, feasibility, analysis, and ethics. For registered reports, do not judge Stage 2 work by whether the results are positive when the approved protocol was followed.

13.7 Methods, software, datasets, and resource papers

Check technical soundness, validation, documentation, interoperability, licensing, access, preservation, limitations, and whether others can understand and reuse the resource.

14. Reporting Guidelines, Transparency, and Reproducibility

Reporting guidelines help reviewers check whether a study is described clearly enough to assess and use. Apply the relevant guideline as an aid, not a substitute for judgement.

Examples include:

- CONSORT for randomized trials;
- PRISMA for systematic reviews and meta-analyses;
- STROBE for observational studies;
- CARE for case reports;
- COREQ or SRQR for qualitative research;
- ARRIVE for animal research;
- STARD for diagnostic-accuracy studies;
- TRIPOD for prediction models;
- CHEERS for health-economic evaluations;
- SAGER for sex and gender equity in research; and
- discipline-specific standards relevant to education, linguistics, psychology, engineering, computing, humanities, and the social sciences.

Flag material omissions, not minor checklist formatting. The test is whether readers can understand what was done, assess the work, and interpret or reuse the findings responsibly.

Check data, code, instruments, protocols, materials, and access statements where relevant. Do not demand public release when valid legal, ethical, privacy, cultural, security, or proprietary limits apply; ask authors to explain the restriction and access route.

15. Research Ethics and Research-Integrity Concerns

Reviewers do not investigate misconduct, but they must report specific concerns confidentially to the editor. Do not contact authors or institutions directly.

Concerns may include:

- plagiarism, unattributed translation, text recycling, or substantial overlap;
- duplicate or simultaneous submission, redundant publication, or inappropriate fragmentation of one study;
- fabrication, falsification, impossible data patterns, or unexplained inconsistencies;
- inappropriate image adjustment, duplication, splicing, or manipulation;
- lack of required ethics approval, informed consent, participant protection, animal-welfare compliance, community permission, or cultural authorization;
- breaches of privacy, confidentiality, or data protection;
- undisclosed funding, sponsorship, competing interests, or editorial assistance;
- authorship concerns, ghost authorship, guest authorship, or undisclosed third-party submission;
- citation manipulation, fabricated references, coercive citation practices, or references that do not support the cited claims;
- peer-review manipulation, false reviewer identities, coordinated review rings, or inappropriate author-reviewer contact;
- paper-mill indicators, template-driven or nonsensical content, manipulated images, or implausible research descriptions;
- unsafe, unlawful, discriminatory, or harmful procedures not adequately justified; and

- undisclosed or inappropriate use of AI that materially affects the reliability or provenance of the work.

When raising a concern, reviewers should:

1. Describe the specific passage, figure, reference, dataset feature, or inconsistency that prompted concern.
2. Provide a citation or link to possible overlapping material when available.
3. Separate observed facts from inference.
4. Place the concern in confidential comments to the Editor, not in accusatory language to the authors.
5. Allow the editor and Sciedu Press to manage any investigation, correction, rejection, or referral.

Do not use peer review to pursue personal disputes or unsupported allegations. Sciedu Press will assess good-faith concerns under its publication ethics procedures.

16. Citation Practices and Requests for Additional References

Suggest additional references only when they are directly relevant and materially improve accuracy, context, method, interpretation, or fairness to prior work.

Reviewers must not:

- require citation of their own work, the journal, the Editor's work, or associates' work for the purpose of increasing citation counts or visibility;
- provide long lists of tangential references;
- condition a favorable recommendation on unnecessary citations;
- demand removal of valid competing perspectives; or
- suggest citations that the reviewer has not verified as relevant.

Explain why a suggested citation matters. Authors need not cite every paper in the field; the editor decides what is necessary.

17. Preparing the Review Report

A useful report is specific, prioritized, evidence-based, and actionable.

17.1 Recommended structure

1. Brief summary: state the manuscript's question, approach, and contribution in two to five sentences. This demonstrates that the reviewer understood the work.
2. Overall assessment: identify the principal strengths and the most important limitations.
3. Major comments: list issues affecting validity, originality, interpretation, ethics, reporting, or suitability. Number each comment and explain why it matters.
4. Minor comments: list localized clarifications, presentation issues, typographical problems, or reference corrections that do not determine publishability.
5. Confidential comments to the Editor: provide the recommendation, unresolved conflicts, ethical concerns, limitations of expertise, and any information that should not be sent directly to the authors.

17.2 Characteristics of effective comments

- Use numbered comments and identify the relevant section, page, paragraph, table, or figure when possible.
- Explain the consequence of each major problem rather than merely labelling it.
- Distinguish required changes from optional suggestions.
- Propose a practical remedy when one is apparent, while avoiding instructions that redesign the entire study unnecessarily.

- Ask focused questions rather than making vague statements such as “methods are weak” or “literature is insufficient.”
- Keep the review proportionate to the manuscript and avoid line-by-line editing unless specifically requested.
- Ensure that the recommendation matches the severity of the written comments.

17.3 Comments to authors

Write comments to authors as if they will be shared in full. Do not include confidential information, speculation about identity, misconduct allegations, personal data, or a recommendation when the journal reserves it for the editor.

17.4 Confidential comments to the Editor

Do not hide major scholarly criticism in confidential comments. Raise it constructively with the authors whenever possible. Use the confidential field for suspected misconduct, conflicts, identity concerns, legal or safety issues, limits to your expertise, and a brief reason for your recommendation.

18. Editorial Recommendations and Decision Categories

Use the recommendation categories in the submission system. The editor may use different terms or reach a different decision.

Recommendation	General meaning
Accept	Publishable as submitted, apart from negligible editorial corrections. Use sparingly.
Minor Revision	Sound overall. The required changes are limited and do not alter the central design, analysis, argument, or conclusions.
Major Revision	Promising, but substantial correctable changes are needed for validity, clarity, completeness, or interpretation.
Reject and Invite Resubmission	Not suitable in its current form, but a substantially reworked new submission may merit consideration if the journal offers this option.
Reject	Fundamental problems are not reasonably correctable, the work lacks sufficient contribution or fit, the conclusions are unsupported, or serious ethics concerns remain.

Judge whether the problems are correctable, not how many comments you wrote. Many minor points may still warrant minor revision; one fatal validity problem may warrant rejection. Use major revision only when the current study can reasonably be corrected.

Do not tell authors that a manuscript is accepted or rejected. The editor makes that decision.

19. Reviewing Revised Manuscripts

Review the revised manuscript with the response letter. Ask whether each major concern was addressed, not whether the authors followed your preferred wording or method.

Reviewers should:

- focus first on prior major comments and the authors' responses;
- acknowledge reasonable rebuttals supported by evidence;
- avoid introducing entirely new requirements unless the revision reveals a new problem, the original review missed a material issue, or new changes require further evaluation;
- check that revisions have not created inconsistencies elsewhere;
- update the recommendation based on the current manuscript rather than defending the original recommendation; and
- maintain confidentiality and conflict disclosure throughout all rounds.

If you cannot review another round, tell the editorial office promptly. The editor may assess the revision or invite another reviewer.

20. Timeliness, Extensions, and Withdrawal from Review

Timely review is part of fair editorial treatment. Reply to invitations and submit reports by the stated deadline.

When delay is likely:

- contact the editorial office as soon as possible;
- request a realistic extension rather than allowing the deadline to pass without communication;
- decline or withdraw when the review cannot be completed to an appropriate standard; and
- do not submit a superficial review merely to meet a deadline.

After withdrawing, keep the manuscript confidential and delete or dispose of files as instructed.

21. Communication with Editors and Authors

Use the journal's editorial system or office for all manuscript communication. Do not contact authors directly, reveal your role, seek unpublished information, negotiate revisions privately, or discuss the manuscript on social media.

Send questions about scope, conflicts, permissions, access, review criteria, suspected misconduct, AI use, or deadlines to the editor. Do not contact an author's institution, funder, employer, ethics committee, or regulator unless required by law and coordinated with Sciedu Press.

After publication, you may discuss the article as any reader would, but do not reveal confidential review information or imply endorsement by the journal.

22. Reviewer Misconduct and Breaches of these Guidelines

Sciedu Press may investigate reviewer conduct. Breaches include:

- breach of confidentiality or unauthorized sharing;
- appropriation of ideas, data, text, or methods;
- undisclosed conflicts of interest;
- impersonation, identity falsification, account misuse, or undisclosed delegation;
- fabricated, AI-generated, copied, or non-substantive reviews;
- abusive, discriminatory, retaliatory, or coercive comments;
- citation manipulation or demands for unnecessary self-citation;
- intentional delay for competitive advantage;
- inappropriate contact with authors;
- false allegations or misuse of confidential information; or
- participation in peer-review manipulation or coordinated review arrangements.

Depending on the evidence and severity, Sciedu Press may disregard the report, seek clarification, warn, suspend, or remove the reviewer, correct reviewer records, notify affected journals or publishers,

or refer a serious matter to an institution or authority. Any action will be fair, confidential, and proportionate.

23. Reviewer Recognition and Record Keeping

Sciedu Press recognizes peer review as scholarly service. Where journal policy and confidentiality allow, recognition may include certificates, acknowledgements, verified review records, profiles, continuing education credit, or invitations to editorial roles.

Recognition must not disclose confidential information or reviewer identity where anonymity applies. Do not identify a manuscript you reviewed or publish the review without authorization.

The editorial office may record expertise, responsiveness, timeliness, report quality, professionalism, conflicts, and ethical concerns to support reviewer selection and quality assurance.