

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Peer review is an important process to judge if the submitted manuscript is suitable for publication in the Translational and Regulatory Sciences (TRS) journal. As independent experts within the same field of research, the peer reviewers are responsible for critically reading, evaluating, and providing authors with feedback to improve their work. TRS adopts a single-blind review. Therefore, all constructive and objective feedback about the manuscript should be returned to the TRS editorial office, at submission@cuts.jp.

Before reviewing, please consider the following:

- ◆ If you are asked to review a manuscript that does not match your area of expertise, please notify the editor as soon as possible. Please only agree to review if you have the necessary expertise to assess the manuscript.
- ◆ The manuscript review should be completed by a certain deadline. If you anticipate that you will not be able to finish reviewing and providing comments by the specified deadline, please notify the relevant editor.
- ◆ If you think there may be a possibility of conflict of interest (financial or otherwise), please consult with the editor.
- ◆ Reviewers are expected to ensure confidentiality of the submitted manuscript. The contents of the manuscript are not to be disseminated or disclosed.
- ◆ Please make sure your review comments are professional, focusing on the work, not on the authors.

Goals of the Review

Through rigorous review by other scientists, the following goals are achieved:

- Guarantee the quality of the research before it is published.
- Improve the quality of the manuscript by clarifying the meaning and important points of the research as well as reducing potential flaws.

Review Criteria

Please use the following criteria as a reference for your review.

1. Originality

Is the manuscript novel and significant enough for publishing? Is the manuscript topic suitable for TRS? Is the research topic important in its scientific area? Prior to peer-review, editors and editorial agents have checked whether or not an identical

or similar paper has already been published. However, if reviewers have any concerns, please notify the editors as soon as possible.

2. Format

Are “Introduction,” “Methods,” “Results,” and “Discussion” properly placed?

- ✓ Does the title describe the intent of the study clearly and adequately?
- ✓ Does the abstract appropriately reflect the content of the manuscript?

3. Introduction

- ✓ Is it clearly stated that the submitted manuscript developed and expanded from the context of existing literature related to the author’s research topic? Further, is the existing literature appropriately explained and quoted?
- ✓ Are the purpose and scope of the study, hypothesis, and predictions identified?

4. Materials and Research Designs

- ✓ Are the study designs appropriate?
- ✓ Are the instruments and materials sufficiently described?
- ✓ Are the study materials and designs described clearly in correct order?
- ✓ In case the study designs are novel, are the designs sufficiently described?
- ✓ Is there enough information for readers to replicate the study?
- ✓ Are the sampling procedures and statistical analysis methods appropriately described?

5. Results

Are the results of the experiments presented appropriately? Precise layout and legitimate order of the experiment’s results are important.

- ✓ Is data analysis appropriate?
- ✓ Are the statistical tests optimal?
- ✓ If reviewers are not proficient in statistical analysis, please let editors know by mentioning so in the review report.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

- ✓ Are the discussion and conclusion justified by the results?
- ✓ Are the discussion and conclusion of the results appropriate?
- ✓ Is the relevance to past research discussed?
- ✓ Is it stated whether the study results support or conflict with existing theories or knowledge?
- ✓ Is it discussed how the knowledge gained from the studies could contribute to further research in the same field?

7. English Grammar

- ✓ Reviewers are not expected to correct English grammar, or spelling. However, if you notice that grammatical mistakes make it difficult to understand scientific or theoretical flow, please insert comments for the editors.

8. Tables and Figures

- ✓ Are all the necessary tables and figures included? Are there any unnecessary figures or tables?
- ✓ Are the numerical data in tables and figures correct?
- ✓ Is the notation of the tables and figures consistent?
- ✓ Are the symbols clearly visible?

9. Reference

- ✓ If the manuscript is based on previous researches, are the quotes from previous literature used appropriately?
- ✓ Are all the author names listed?
- ✓ Does the reference style meet the "Guidelines for Authors?"
- ✓ Is the date of review stated in case of quotes from website?

10. Ethics

If you suspect plagiarism, please notify the editors of your suspicion.

11. Fraud and Fabrication

It would not be easy to identify fraud or fabrication, however, in case of any doubt, please notify the editors as soon as possible.

12. Other Ethical Guidelines

Were the animal experiments and/or clinical trials conducted in accordance with the appropriate guidelines?

- ✓ Animal experiments: Is the name of the ethical committee which approved the animal experiments mentioned in the manuscript?
- ✓ Clinical studies: Is the name of the ethical committee which approved the clinical studies mentioned in the manuscript? Is the IRB approval form attached?

13. Natural Product and Crude Extract Materials

In studies regarding natural products and crude extract materials (NP/CEM), a complete description and information on the sources of the NP/CEM, extraction methods for the CEM, et cetera, should be provided.

Review Report

- ✧ Please start your review report with a concise summary of the essential points of the manuscript. It gives the editors a picture of the entire work, and also lets editors and authors know that the reviewers correctly understood the contents of the manuscript.
- ✧ Please include thorough and constructive comments in the report.
 - ✓ Please be specific in any criticism or recommendation.
 - ✓ Please provide background reasons for the comments.
 - ✓ Please make sure your comments are based on objective scientific data.
- ✧ Please provide overall recommendations for or against publication. Choose the most appropriate option from below.
 - A) Reject
 - B) Accept without revision/correction
 - C) Accept with minor revision
 - D) Accept with major revision
- ✧ C or D manuscripts
Requests for revisions have to be as specific as possible. Please let editors know if you would like to be responsible for reviewing a resubmitted manuscript.