



RE: Manuscript No \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dear \_\_\_\_\_

We hope you will **accept** to review this manuscript for the *Archive of Oncology*. *Archive of Oncology* is an international peer reviewed journal published in English. The editorial board strictly adheres to the principles of Good Scientific Practice related to the publication policy.

Our review process:

*Archive of Oncology* **peer reviews all the material it receives.**

**Reviewers advise the editors who are responsible for the final decision to accept or reject a manuscript.**

*Archive of Oncology* has a system of "blind" peer review.

The aim of *Archive of Oncology* is to publish high quality medical information. We are particularly seeking your **comments on the originality of the work and its importance** and relevance to the subject as a whole.

If the manuscript does not fall within the field of your expertise, please forward it to a colleague who might do an expert review.

The names of reviewers for the *Archive of Oncology* appear in the fourth issue of the given year. As a sign of our appreciation for your assistance we offer you to receive the *Archive of Oncology* free of charge for the next year.

We cordially invite you and your colleagues to contribute your manuscripts to the *Archive of Oncology*.

Vladimir Vit. Baltić, Editor-in-Chief

## **GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPT REVIEWERS**

**The manuscript is a confidential document.** Please do not discuss this even with the author.

As a reviewer you will be advising the editors who make the final decision. We will pass on your report to the author; please do not make any comments that you do not wish the author to see. Even if we do not accept a paper we would like to pass on your constructive comments that might help the authors to improve it.

Please give detailed comments (with references, whenever possible) that will help both the editors to make decision on the paper and the authors to improve it.

The manuscript review process consists of the following parts:

1. **Summary analysis of the manuscript with recommendation about acceptance, revision or rejection.** This part is for editor and is confidential.
2. **A brief appraisal for editor**, which should give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. This is also confidential.
3. **A detailed appraisal for the author** divided into minor and major comments with annotations given according to page and paragraph. This part is sent to authors.

**Please reply until \_\_\_\_\_ (date)**

If this is not possible, please inform the editor of the delay or recommend a competent and willing colleague .

Please return to: Ms Sabine Terzic, secretary general:

**Archive of Oncology, Editorial Office**

Institute of Oncology Sremska Kamenica, Institutski put 4, 21204 Sremska Kamenica, Yugoslavia

Tel. +381 21 615 711 ext 461 Fax: . +381 21 6153 741

e-mail: [archive@onko.onk.ns.ac.yu](mailto:archive@onko.onk.ns.ac.yu)



**Form page 1**

Manuscript No: \_\_\_\_\_

First author: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer No: \_\_\_\_\_

**MANUSCRIPT REVIEW (for Editors only)**

**A. QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

For each question, please use the following scale of answer: "To which extent does the article meet this criterion"

1	Fails to a great extent	Succeeds to a small extent	4
2	Fails to a moderate extent	Succeeds to a moderate extent	5
3	Fails to a small extent	Succeeds to a large extent	6
NA Not applicable			

For all papers:

- The paper is important and adds enough to existing knowledge 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- The paper is read well and makes sense 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA

For research papers:

- The issue discussed in this article is worthy of investigation 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- Presented information is new 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- The most important previous studies have been cited 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- The hypothesis is clearly defined 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- The overall design is appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- Participants studied are adequately described and their conditions defined 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- Methods are described specifically enough to be evaluated (for randomized trial CONSORT style was followed) 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- The results clearly answered the research question 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- Interpretation and conclusions are warranted by and derived from the data 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- References are relevant up to date and without glaring omissions 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA
- Abstract accurately reflects the contents of the paper 1 2 3 4 5 6 NA

Total score .....

Please, use your discretion about the list when reporting on other types of paper.

**B. OVERALL DECISION (please tick)**

Reject       Major Revision       Minor Revision       Accept

**C. COMMENTS FOR EDITORS:**

Please give a brief and frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript (use additional sheet if necessary).

If you think the manuscript needs major revision, would you like to see it again?      Yes       No

Signature of the reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_      Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**For office use only:**

**Sent out:** \_\_\_\_\_      **Expected:** \_\_\_\_\_      **Received:** \_\_\_\_\_



**Form page 2**

**COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS:**

Please group your remarks into major and minor comments with annotations given accordingly to page and paragraph (use additional sheet if necessary).

***Please do not sign your comments!***



**DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST**

Guidance for reviewers

A competing interest exists when professional judgment concerning a primary interest (such as patients' welfare or validity of research) may be influenced by a secondary interest (such as financial gain or personal rivalry).

It may arise for the reviewers when they have a **financial interest** that may influence – probably without their knowing – their interpretation of an article. We will **not reject reviewer's opinion simply because she/he has a competing interest**, but we would like to know about it.

We used to ask authors and reviewers about any competing interests, but we have decided to restrict our request to financial interests.

*Please answer the following questions:*

**1. Have you in the past five years accepted the following from an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper:**

- Reimbursement for attending a symposium? .....
- A fee for speaking? .....
- A fee for organizing education? .....
- Funds for research? .....
- Funds for a member staff? .....
- Fees for consulting? .....

**2. Have you in the past five years been employed by an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?**

**3. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?**

**4. Do you have any other competing interests? If so, please specify.**

**If you might want to disclose \* another sort of competing interest that would embarrass you if it become generally known after publication, please add it to your statement.**

**Please complete option 1 or 2 as appropriate and sign below:**

**1. I have no competing interest in relation to this paper.     (please tick)**

*or*

**2. I have the following competing interest:**

.....  
 .....  
 .....

**Title of the paper:**

.....  
 .....  
 .....

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*\*Examples:*

- A close relationship with, or strong antipathy to, a person whose interests may be affected by a publication of your paper.
- An academic link or rivalry with somebody whose interests may be affected by a publication of your paper.
- Membership of a political party or special interest group whose interests may be affected by a publication of your paper.
- A deep personal or religious conviction that may have affected what you wrote and those readers should be aware of when reading your paper.