

## Reviewing *PDA JPST* Manuscripts

In order to ensure that articles published in the *PDA JPST* are scientifically rigorous, all submissions are subjected to single-blind peer review. We depend on the comments, suggestions and recommendations of reviewers to determine whether or not the submitted work should be published, or what revisions may be needed.

Reviewers are expected to read through the manuscript carefully with these questions in mind:

1. Is the work reported in the manuscript of interest to the industry? Is it of sufficient scientific significance to warrant publication? [Note: The *PDA JPST* publishes a variety of manuscript types in addition to research material; each should be evaluated accordingly.]
2. Are the assumptions or theory upon which the work is based valid? Is the experimental design adequate to substantiate the conclusions?
3. Are the data reported sufficient to support the conclusions? Are they presented clearly?
4. Is the content of the manuscript structured in a clear and concise manner? Are there sections of the paper that should be clarified, expanded, condensed, or deleted? Is the material readable and the language grammatically correct?
5. Are the title and abstract concise? Do they accurately reflect the content of the work?
6. Are the figures, tables, structures, and schemes useful and relevant? Are they succinct and designed for clarity? Are they cited at appropriate points in the text?
7. Are the references current and appropriate? Are there too many (or too few) to support the work? Are significant references missing?

To make a review as helpful as possible for both the author(s) and the Editor, we ask reviewers to provide courteous and constructive comments regarding methods, study design, statistical analysis of results, validity of conclusions, and rationality of discussion arguments. Comments can be specific, suggest alternative ideas to consider, question discussions or calculations or recommend more current references. Reviewers would note any deficiencies they may find in the work and explain, if possible, how they might be remedied.

After reviewing the manuscript, the reviewer recommends to the Editor the next step for the manuscript: accept it without change, accept it after revision (usually minor), reconsider it after extensive revision (which requires a second review), or reject it (giving reasons why).

### Blinding

Manuscripts submitted to the *PDA JPST* are routinely vetted through a single-blind peer-review process. This ensures that articles meet the high standards of this publication.

The online review system keeps reviewer identities confidential. However, reviewers who choose to download the manuscript and insert comments in a PDF file and then reupload it for the author will reveal their identity if they do not mask their comments. Reviewers can mask their comments in Adobe; directions are provided in the “Reviewer Submission Instructions.”

### Submitting Review

All reviews are submitted online through the Reviewer Area of the Peertrack™ Editorial Manager® submission and review system.

*Note: PDA JPST Editors are solely responsible for soliciting and delegating peer reviewers for submitted manuscripts. Please do not pass along your request to review directly to another subject matter expert. Instead, if you know of a qualified candidate with relevant expertise, kindly propose the name of the potential candidate to the PDA JPST Editor.*