

## REVIEWERS INSTRUCTIONS

1. The unpublished manuscript is a privileged document. Please protect it from any form of exploitation. Reviewers are expected not to cite a manuscript or refer to the work it describes before it has been published, and to refrain from using the information it contains for the advancement of their own research.
2. Does the paper fall within the scope of the *Archives of Oral Sciences and Research*?
3. Are the findings of the article novel or present a conclusion that is different from previous studies thus throwing light on a new possible hypothesis?
4. Are the conclusions of the study justified?
5. Journal space is at a premium. Check the need for tables and figures and the adequacy of the references. Point out places where the prose can be condensed: introductions should be concise and to the point; discussions should address the implications of the new information revealed by the results.
6. A reviewer should consciously adopt a positive, impartial attitude towards the manuscript under review. Your position should be that of the author's ally, with the aim of promoting effective and accurate scientific communication.
7. Include Comments to Editor to convey the basis for your recommendation for acceptance or rejection. These comments will NOT be conveyed to the author.
8. Include Comments to Author to convey specific feedback to the author on your recommendation. Please do NOT give reference to the Comments to Editor field as the author will not have direct access to those comments.
9. Recommendation: whether to Accept, Minor Revision, Major Revision or Reject.
10. If you believe that you cannot judge a given article impartially, please return the manuscript immediately to the editor with that explanation.
11. Reviews should be completed expeditiously, within 3-4 weeks. If you know that you cannot finish the review within the time specified, please inform the editor.
12. A reviewer should not discuss a paper with its author/s. If you want to consult a colleague or junior please discuss this with us first.
13. Even if we do not accept a paper we would like to pass on constructive comments that might help the author to improve it. For this reason please give detailed comments (with references, if appropriate) that will help both the editors to make a decision on the paper and the authors to improve it.
14. The editor gratefully receives a reviewer's recommendations, but since the editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources, a reviewer should not expect the editor to honor his or her every recommendation.