

CMJ GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Dear reviewers, the CMJ editorial team welcomes an informative peer review report and greatly appreciates your efforts and contribution to our journal. The peer review process in the CMJ is double-blind, ie, the identities of both the reviewers and authors are not revealed during the manuscript processing. The reviewers should respect the strict confidentiality of the review process. They are free to consult the guidelines developed by COPE (https://publicationethics.org/files/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers-v2_0.pdf) and ICMJE (<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/responsibilities-in-the-submission-and-peer-review-process.html#three>).

The reviewers of the original research articles should follow the instructions given below.

The reviewers of other manuscript categories (reviews, case reports, brief communications, opinion papers, essays) should explain in short the major and minor issues burdening the manuscript.

REVIEWER'S FORM – COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS

Your comments for authors should address the major and minor issues of the manuscript. Specific questions listed below are here to assist you in writing your review. In case of even one major issue, authors may be requested to perform a major revision, or the manuscript may be rejected, whereas in case of minor issues, significant revisions may be required, but the manuscript cannot be rejected. Instead of answering our questions with "yes" or "no", explain what you have in mind when dealing with a specific issue. If the question is not applicable to the given manuscript, please just put N/A.

• Major issues

1. Is the manuscript sufficiently novel to warrant publication and does it add to the canon of knowledge?
2. Is the research question well defined, hypothesis clearly stated, and aims well postulated?
3. Is the study appropriately designed to investigate the research question?
4. What is the overall quality of the methodological approach? Are there any major shortcomings of the methods used?
5. Is there anything that you would suggest that could improve the organization of the manuscript and the information flow?
6. What, in your opinion, are the strengths of the manuscript?
7. What, in your opinion, are the limitations of the manuscript?

• Minor issues

1. Do the title and abstract reflect the content of the manuscript, and can the title catch the attention of readers?
2. Does the Introduction present the background and all relevant research in the field?
3. Do the authors correctly categorize the type of the study? Are all the methods relevant for the study of such type? Are the methods described in enough detail to allow the replication of the study? Was the sampling appropriate?
4. In your opinion, is statistical analysis well performed and described?
5. Are the figures, images and tables well organized and informative?
6. Are the claims in the discussion supported by the results? Do the authors give any limitations of their study? Does the conclusion explain how the research has enriched the body of scientific knowledge?
7. Other.

• Concluding statement

Please give an overall rating of the manuscript quality in a few conclusive sentences, without specifying your final recommendation about publication. The final decision (acceptance, revisions, rejection) is made by the editors, based on recommendations of all reviewers as stated in the confidential part of the reviewer's form addressed to editors.

REVIEWER'S FORM – COMMENTS FOR EDITORS

The table below lists specific issues regarding the quality of the manuscript. Please either underline your answer directly in the table, or write down your answers for each question.

What is your overall estimation on the originality, novelty and importance of the manuscript?	High/Average/Low
Does the abstract reflect the major points of the manuscript content?	Yes / No / Not applicable
Is the manuscript interesting to read and easy to follow?	Yes / No / Not applicable
Is the list of references appropriate and up-to-date?	Yes / No / Not applicable
What is your recommendation regarding the publication of the manuscript?	Accept/Minor revision/Major revision/Reject
If necessary, would you accept to re-review the revised version of the manuscript?	Yes / No / Not applicable