



Editorial Guideline for Peer Reviewers

Invitation: The invitation comes from the editor in charge who has identified you as the most competent reviewer for an expertise. At this stage, a link to access your referee's homepage is given to you. There, you will find the manuscript and a questionnaire giving instructions on the specific feedback that is required. From this page, you are invited to **tell us whether you agree to review the manuscript**. The editor will appreciate being informed within a day or two if you are able to complete the review or not.

Competences: Please only agree to review a manuscript if **you feel you have the subject expertise required**. Metallurgical Research & Technology's aims and scope can be found at: <http://www.metallurgical-research.org>. Please look at this page to ensure that your comments are in accordance with the journal's policy. By the way, please inform us when you ask a colleague for help with a review or if you mentor a more junior colleague in conducting the peer review.

Deadline for receiving your report: A report is generally expected within **approximately 3 weeks**. Otherwise, the editor can discuss a deadline better suited to your plans. If you feel the review will take you longer to complete than expected, please contact the editor to discuss the matter. For instance, the editor may be willing to wait a little longer if the paper is highly specialized and reviewers in the domain are difficult to find. A **reminder** is sent to you within one week from the date of the invitation and repeatedly until we get your reply.

Cancellation and replacement: If you are unable to help us, **please do not wait** and kindly let us know immediately. There are no consequences for refusing to review a paper. If possible, **suggest alternative referees** (name and email contact).

Your identity: Our journal does NOT communicate the identity of the reviewer to the authors. To help us protect your identity, please **do not reveal your name within the text of your report**. This implies that you do not contact the authors directly.

Evaluation: You are first invited to reply to the following **questions** and then give your **general assessment**:

- Is the subject matter within the scope of the journal?
- Does the paper contain enough original results to warrant publication?
- Is the paper technically sound and free of errors?
- Is the work clearly and concisely presented? Is it well organized?
- Are the industrial applications developed enough?
- Are the scientific developments investigated enough?
- Does the title clearly and sufficiently reflect its contents?
- Is the abstract informative? Are the main results and conclusions mentioned?
- Is the scientific discussion sound and not misleading?
- Are the illustrations of adequate quality, relevant and understandable?
- Does the bibliography give a clear view of the current state-of-the-art in the domain?
- Is the quality of the language satisfactory?
- Should the paper be shortened (material/figures irrelevant or redundant)?
- Is the paper expected to have a high impact?

Your general evaluation:

- Excellent
- good
- average
- marginal
- poor

Further recommendation:

- Acceptable without revision
- Acceptable with major revisions
- Acceptable with minor revisions
- Reject

Language: If an article is poorly written due to grammatical errors, and difficult to understand, you do **not** need to correct the English/French. Please simply bring this to the attention of the editor. Note that all accepted papers written in English are seen by a copy editor.

Confidential comments: An author does not see the confidential comments that are specifically addressed to the editor.

Revision: The editor can decide to send you the revised version and author's reply for a re-evaluation. In that case, other reviewers' comments are sent to you for information, unless otherwise stated.

Final decision: Whatever the editor finally decides, you have feedback on your review and on whether the paper is accepted or rejected.

Basic ethical principles

Metallurgical Research & Technology adheres to COPE (*Committee on Publication Ethics*). Please read carefully the basic principles for peer reviewers at:

http://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_guidelines_for_peer_reviewers_0.pdf

The main basic principles we kindly ask you to adhere to:

- Please keep all manuscript and review details confidential
- Declare all potential conflicting interests to the journal
- Be objective, honest and constructive
- Respond without unnecessary or intentional delay
- Declare if you have already reviewed the manuscript for another journal
- Notify the journal immediately if you come across any irregularities, have concerns about ethical aspects of the work, or suspect misconduct
- Provide the names of any individuals who have helped you with the review
- Do not contact the authors directly without the explicit permission of the journal
- Be specific in your criticisms, and provide evidence with appropriate references to substantiate general statements

For any queries relating to the content of the paper or technical issues, please contact the editorial office (revue-metallurgie@edpsciences.org) or the managing editor (ariana.fuga@edpsciences.org).