

# Manual for Reviewers

1. Each time Editors have a manuscript for review, they assign reviewers and send them notification emails.
2. Upon receiving an email with a request to review a manuscript, consider whether to accept or decline the suggestion, then click the option [I agree to review](#) or [I do not agree to review, please find another candidate](#).
3. To access the **Reviewer Interface**, visit [www.scipress.com](http://www.scipress.com) and log in. On the **Top** menu, in the **Choose Role** box, select **Reviewer** from the list.
4. On the **Reviewer menu**, click the **Papers** tab to see the list of manuscripts assigned to you for review.
5. On the **Papers** page, in the table, find the Paper Title, PDF file of the paper, Editor's Name, Paper status, and the link to the web form of Reviewer's Report.
6. To download the file of the manuscript, in the **View Paper** column, click the **document icon**.
7. Having reviewed the manuscript, return to the **Papers** page and, in the **Review** column, click **Enter/Update** to open the **Review** web form for completing your Reviewer's Report.

The screenshot shows the SciPress website interface for a reviewer. At the top, there are navigation links for Home, About us, Contact, My Cart, User Name, Reviewer, and Logout. Below this is the SciPress logo and a search bar. A blue bar contains the 'Reviewer menu:' and a 'Papers' tab. The main content area is titled 'Papers' and includes a 'Show By:' dropdown set to '10'. Below this is a table with the following data:

Paper	View Paper	Assigned Editor	Paper Status	Review
Homotopy Analysis Method for Conformable Burgers-Korteweg-de Vries equation	 5 MB (11.08.2016 9:14) 5 MB - uploaded: 11.08.2016 9:14	Alexander Shchitov	In Review	<a href="#">Enter/Update</a>
Minimum Equitable Dominating Randic Energy of a Graph	 162 KB (31.08.2016 8:07)	Alexander Shchitov	In Review	<a href="#">Enter/Update</a>
Influence of the Zonal Harmonics of the Primary on $L_{4,5}$ in the Photogravitational ER3BP	 775 KB (20.08.2016 16:21)	Alexander Shchitov	In Review	<a href="#">Enter/Update</a>

8. In the **Review** web form, complete all mandatory fields (marked with asterisk). You may type your comments into the **Remarks** box or/and upload your recommendations and additional information as a separate **.doc/.pdf** file.
9. To save the report without sending it to the Editor, click **Save and Continue Editing** or **Save and Return**.
10. When your work on the report is finished, click **Submit to Editor**, then click **Ok**. Once your report was submitted, you will not be able to change it anymore.

## Review

---

**Title:** Bulletin of Mathematical Sciences and Applications

**Paper:** Homotopy Analysis Method for Conformable Burgers-Korteweg-de Vries equation

**Author(s):** Orkun TASBOZAN, Ali KURT, Yücel Cenesiz

---

\* Marked fields must be filled

**A. Recommendation (Please check appropriate option)**

Publish as is

Publish after optional minor revision

Publish after mandatory minor/major revision

Reject

---

**B. Checklist**

1. Is the manuscript of high scientific quality? *	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
2. Is the manuscript free from errors? *	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
3. Is the paper well organized? *	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
4. Is the title appropriate? *	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
5. Are the references to related work adequate? *	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
6. Is the English satisfactory? *	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
7. Are the figures clear? *	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Not applicable
8. Are the tables clear? *	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not applicable

---

**C. Remarks:**

**i** Please, summarize the reasons for your overall recommendation and provide us with helpful suggestions (especially regarding "No" answers on the Checklist) to improve the manuscript

Type your comments here

---

**D. Attachment (additional comments can be uploaded here as Word or PDF)**

No attachment

**i** Important: Once your report is submitted, no more changes can be made

## Conducting the Review

**Please note!** All reviewers have to follow the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers as outlined by the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#).

The Reviewer will be asked to evaluate the manuscript based on a number of criteria.

- I. Originality.
  - Is the paper original?
  - Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting for publication?
  - Does the paper meet the journal standards?
  - Is the scientific research an important one?
  
- II. Structure.
  - Is the paper well-structured?
  - Are the figures clear?
  - Are the tables clear?
  - Does the paper have all the key elements: keywords, abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions and discussions, references?
  - Consider each aspect:
    - Language – Is English satisfactory? Is the manuscript free from errors?
    - Title – Is the title appropriate?
    - Keywords - Are the keywords appropriate?
    - Abstract – Does it convey the content of the paper?
    - Introduction – Does the author state the objectives of the work, indicate the relevance of the results and give references to relevant literature? Does it describe what the author aimed to achieve and clearly outline the problem under investigation?
    - Methodology – Does the author accurately explain the data collected? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are the equipment and materials adequately described? Does the paper contain sufficient information to replicate the research?
    - Results – Is there any explanation what the author discovered in the research? Do all of the author's results have proofs?
    - Conclusions and Discussions – Do the conclusions correspond to the results? Does the author point how the results relate to earlier research? Do the conclusions explain the significance of the obtained results?
    - References – Are there any important works that have not been included? Are the references to related works adequate? Are the references accurate?

The Reviewer should give explanations and arguments in the Reviewer's Report so that both Editors and Authors would be able to fully understand the reasoning behind Reviewer's comments. Reviewers' comments on the manuscript should be detailed and constructive to enable the Editors make a decision on the publication and help the Author(s) correct and improve the submitted manuscript.