Recommendations to reviewers

The Quetelet Journal subjects its publications to a double-blind review process. By agreeing to review one manuscript, you are a key contributor in our publication process and we are very grateful for that. Your review must guide the decisions of the editors and allow authors to improve their manuscript. Your role is not to correct the article, but to make constructive comments and suggestions with kindness and respect. To help you write your review, a guide is at your disposal reminding you of the objectives and stages of a review as well as a review form based on five criteria which you can use to fill on the website. During the reviewing process, the emphasis will be on the scientific rigour and not on the (positive, negative, or null) direction of results found by the authors, in the spirit of “Blind-result review”.

A reminder of the objectives of a critical review:

- Select research of high scientific quality
- Improve the quality of research: reinforcing key arguments and correcting errors

Before initiating the review, please check that you can answer positively to the following 3 questions:

- Do you have the expertise on all or part of the subject?
- Do you have a minimum amount of time to devote to this critical review?
- Are you certain that you have no potential conflicts of interest (personal or scientific) that could be considered in your evaluation?

1. The critical review

The critical review is addressed to both the editors and the author(s): it must be written accordingly, both to guide the decisions of the editors and to allow the author(s) to improve their manuscript, whatever the final decision. The role of the reviewer is not to correct the article directly, but to give
suggestions to help the author(s) improve the clarity, efficiency and quality of presentation. Positive comments, in addition to constructive criticism, are welcome.

If one or more of the arguments put forward by the author(s) seems to you to be erroneous or incomplete, you are asked to provide references to support your argument.

The structure of the critical review is still at the preference of the reviewer, but the editors strongly recommend that it be carried out in five steps:

- **First of all, summarize the purpose of the article in one or two sentences**: theme and objectives, research question, main hypothesis.

- Then review the main parts of the article (see criteria in the reading grid below). **If possible, please reference the page, table and/or figure number where specific elements are explicitly mentioned in the commentary**.

- Use the review form below to evaluate the manuscript and complete the form on the Journal website.

- **Conclude the review with general comments** that summarize the main arguments that justify the final decision to accept or reject the article.

2. **Review form**:

   **Importance and originality of the research question**

   - Does the introduction provide sufficient information to understand the problem and identify the gap that the article will fill?

   - Does the text accurately describe what the authors hope to achieve, the problem to be addressed and the hypotheses to be tested?

   **Knowledge of the literature on the subject**

   - Is previous research relevant to the research subject synthesized? Do the authors explain, where appropriate, if previous findings by other authors are questioned or expanded upon?

   - Is the originality of the research (with regard to the existing literature, the data used or the approach adopted in particular) explicitly present in the text?

   **Data Adequacy**

   - Is it specified how the data presented in the manuscript are appropriate to answer the research question?

   - Does the article specify the data used (mode of collection, representativeness, etc.), as well as their possible biases or limitations?

   **Use of methods and quality of analyses**
- Is the analytical methodology used presented clearly and concisely so that it can be repeated in other research circumstances?

- Is the method of analysis appropriate to the objectives of the text? If not, what should authors do to correct this?

- Are the results properly analyzed? Is the authors' discourse adequate with what can be done with the analyses?

- Do the interpretations correspond to the results presented? Did the authors provide sufficient evidence to support their claims? If not, what would you recommend?

**Structure of the article**

- Is the text as a whole presented in a clear, concise and rigorous manner?

- Is the organization of ideas optimal to answer the research question posed?

- Do all tables and figures help the reader to better understand the text? If not, which ones could be deleted or added?

**Clarity of writing**

- Is the writing clear and accessible?

- Is the bibliography complete, well presented, adapted to the theme, not too old?

**3. The recommendation**

The recommendation to accept or reject an article must be motivated and the review form should allow you to objectify this recommendation.

Five types of recommendations can be made:

- **Accepted for publication**: the article is accepted as such or with small modifications that concern only the form of the article (spelling mistakes, missing bibliographical references, etc.).

- **Accepted for publication but with revisions**: the article is accepted, provided that certain corrections are made by the authors of the article. These corrections must concern relatively minor elements, for example, interpretations and explanations to be clarified, references to be added, figures to be modified or completed, parts to be moved, etc.

- **Article to be resubmitted to Quetelet Journal**: as it stands, the article is not publishable and a major revision is still needed. The structure of the article is clumsy, the methods are not sound enough and/or results are confusing, errors of analysis or interpretation remain in the text, etc. The article is therefore not accepted as it stands, but if the authors are willing to commit themselves to improving the manuscript, they may resubmit it at a later date. Nevertheless, given the magnitude of the changes requested, the evaluation process will start all over again.
with the resubmission. The argument in favour of this decision is that the article has potential but, as it stands, is either insufficiently or incorrectly exploited.

- **Article to be submitted to another journal**: the theme of the article is not aligned with the papers published in the Quetelet Journal. Authors are therefore invited to submit their manuscript to another journal.

- **Rejected**: If too many corrections are required or if the article is incorrect and inadmissible, the article is rejected and the journal will not accept another submission of this manuscript.