Instructions for Reviewers

Thank you for agreeing to review a manuscript for Translation. Peer review is an essential part of maintaining the quality, integrity, and scientific rigor of the journal. We appreciate the time and expertise you contribute to this process.

1. Reviewer Invitations and Review Timeline

The Editorial Board oversees reviewer selection and assignments. Invitations to review are sent through the journal's Open Journal Systems (OJS) platform.

Please respond to the invitation as soon as possible by accepting or declining the review.

Before accepting an invitation, please consider:

- Whether the manuscript falls within your area of expertise or whether you can provide a meaningful perspective on the topic.
- Whether you have any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest involving the manuscript, authors, institutions, or subject matter.
- Whether you can complete the review within the requested timeframe.

Reviews should generally be completed within 2 weeks of acceptance.

If you are unable to complete the review within the allotted timeframe, please contact the Editorial Team as soon as possible. An extension may be granted when appropriate.

If you are not qualified to review the manuscript or have a conflict of interest that could affect the impartiality of your assessment, please decline the invitation. When possible, you may recommend another qualified reviewer.

2. Confidentiality

Translation uses a single-blind peer-review process. Reviewer identities are not disclosed to authors.

Manuscripts submitted to the journal are confidential documents and should be treated as such. Reviewers must not:

- Share the manuscript or any part of it with others without permission from the Editorial Team.
- Discuss the manuscript or its contents with the authors or other individuals outside the editorial process.
- Use unpublished information, data, methods, or ideas obtained through the review process for personal or professional advantage.
- Upload the manuscript or its contents to publicly accessible platforms or external artificial intelligence (AI) tools without explicit authorization from the journal.

Please also avoid including information in your comments that could inadvertently reveal your identity to the authors.

After completing the review, please retain or dispose of manuscript materials in accordance with the journal's confidentiality requirements.

3. Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers should disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest before accepting or completing a review.

Examples may include:

- A recent or ongoing collaboration with one or more of the authors.
- A personal, professional, academic, or financial relationship with an author.
- A direct competitive relationship with the authors or their research.
- A strong personal or professional interest that could affect the objectivity of the review.
- Familiarity with the manuscript or substantially similar work through another confidential review process.

Having a potential conflict does not necessarily mean that you cannot review the manuscript. If you are uncertain whether a relationship constitutes a conflict, please contact the Editorial Team before proceeding.

4. Reviewer Responsibilities

The purpose of peer review is to provide an objective, constructive, and evidence-based assessment of the manuscript.

Reviewers should evaluate the manuscript based primarily on its scientific quality, originality, clarity, methodological rigor, interpretation of results, and relevance to the journal's readership.

Reviewers are not expected to assess administrative, formatting, or pre-review compliance requirements that are handled by the journal's editorial teams.

Scientific and Scholarly Quality

- Is the research question, objective, or purpose clearly stated?
- Is the topic relevant to the scope of Translation?
- Does the manuscript provide a meaningful contribution to the literature?
- Are the methods appropriate for the research question or objectives?
- Are the methods described in sufficient detail to understand and evaluate the work?
- Are the results presented clearly and supported by the data?
- Are statistical analyses, when applicable, appropriate and adequately reported?
- Are the conclusions supported by the results?
- Are limitations appropriately acknowledged?
- Are claims appropriately supported by the evidence and cited literature?

Organization and Presentation

- Is the manuscript logically organized?
- Is the writing sufficiently clear for the intended readership?
- Are tables and figures accurate, necessary, and appropriately referenced in the text?
- Is information unnecessarily repeated between the text, tables, and figures?
- Are the references relevant and appropriate to the manuscript?

Reviewers do not need to focus on minor grammatical, spelling, punctuation, or formatting issues. These matters will be addressed during the editorial and copyediting processes.

5. Constructive Reviewer Feedback

Reviewer comments should be specific, professional, and constructive. The goal is to help authors improve the manuscript while providing the Editorial Board with sufficient information to make an informed editorial decision.

When providing comments:

- Begin by identifying important strengths of the manuscript.
- Clearly identify major concerns that affect the validity, interpretation, or presentation of the work.
- Distinguish major concerns from minor concerns.
- Explain why a particular issue is important and, when appropriate, suggest a specific way it could be addressed.
- Focus comments on the manuscript rather than the authors.
- Avoid language that is dismissive, personal, or unnecessarily harsh.
- Identify unclear statements, unsupported conclusions, methodological concerns, or inconsistencies.
- Point out unnecessary duplication among the text, tables, and figures.
- If the manuscript would benefit from shortening or restructuring, provide specific recommendations.
- If the reference list contains unnecessary or redundant references, identify specific references that could be removed.

Because manuscripts submitted to Translation are generally intended to represent projects of limited scope and duration, reviewers should evaluate the work as submitted. Reviewers should not require extensive additional experiments, data collection, or analyses that are beyond the reasonable scope of the manuscript unless they are essential to support the validity of the conclusions.

Serious methodological or reporting deficiencies that cannot reasonably be addressed through revision may be grounds for rejection.

6. Confidential Comments to the Editor

The Confidential Comments to the Editor section is intended for information that should not be shared with the authors.

Please use this section to report:

- Concerns regarding plagiarism, duplicate publication, fabrication, falsification, or other potential research misconduct.
- Undisclosed conflicts of interest.
- Serious concerns about the manuscript that may affect the editorial decision.
- Any other information that the Editorial Board should consider when evaluating the manuscript.

Your recommendation regarding the manuscript should be provided only in the Confidential Comments to the Editor section.

Please briefly explain the rationale for your recommendation.

7. Comments to the Authors

The Comments to the Authors section should contain the detailed, constructive feedback that can be shared with the authors.

A useful review should address both strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript.

Major Comments

Identify issues affecting the study's validity, interpretation, methodology, or major conclusions, including substantial gaps in reporting or important concerns that should be addressed before the manuscript can be considered further.

Minor Comments

Identify smaller issues involving clarity, terminology, organization, references, tables, figures, or presentation.

8. Recommendation Categories

The reviewer form provides the following recommendation categories:

- Accept
- Accept with Minor Revision
- Accept with Major Revision
- Reject

Not every recommendation category will necessarily apply to every manuscript or article type.

Your recommendation should reflect the overall quality of the manuscript and whether the concerns identified can reasonably be addressed through revision.

The final editorial decision is made by the Editorial Board after consideration of the reviewer reports and other relevant factors. A decision may differ from an individual reviewer's recommendation.

9. Online-Only Supplemental Material

If the manuscript includes online-only supplemental material, please review it along with the main manuscript.

Consider whether the supplemental material:

- Is necessary to support or clarify the manuscript.
- Is accurate and relevant to the manuscript.
- Is appropriately organized and presented.
- Contains information that would be better incorporated into the main manuscript.
- Is unnecessarily long or duplicative.

Please provide specific recommendations when changes to the supplemental material are needed.

10. Additional Guidance for Case Reports

Case Reports should provide a clear and meaningful contribution to the medical literature. Reviewers should consider whether the case presents a sufficiently unusual, informative, or educational observation to justify publication.

Examples of potentially appropriate Case Reports include:

- A previously unreported disease or clinical entity.
- A new syndrome or unusual clinical presentation.
- A previously unknown or clinically important manifestation of a common disease.
- A new insight into the pathophysiology of a common disease.
- An important or previously unrecognized adverse effect of a commonly used medication.
- A novel therapeutic application or clinically meaningful response to a treatment.
- An unusual clinical experience that may stimulate further investigation.
- A clinical observation that may influence the management of similar patients.

When reviewing a Case Report, consider:

- Is the case sufficiently unusual, novel, or educational?
- Is the clinical presentation clearly described?
- Is the diagnostic evaluation adequately explained?
- Are the treatment and clinical course clearly presented?
- Are the conclusions supported by the case?
- Does the discussion appropriately explain the significance of the case?
- Are relevant alternative diagnoses or explanations addressed?

A Case Report that does not provide a sufficiently meaningful contribution to the literature may not be appropriate for publication.

11. Use of Artificial Intelligence in Peer Review

Peer review materials are confidential. Reviewers should not enter manuscripts, figures, tables, unpublished data, or other confidential manuscript content into external AI systems unless the journal has explicitly authorized such use and the system meets applicable confidentiality requirements.

AI tools should not replace the reviewer's independent scholarly judgment. Reviewers remain responsible for the accuracy, fairness, and confidentiality of their submitted review.

If AI assistance is used in accordance with journal policy, reviewers should follow any applicable disclosure requirements established by the journal.

12. Submitting Your Review

Once your review is complete, submit it through the manuscript's Reviewer Center in OJS.

After successfully submitting your review, you will receive confirmation from the Editorial Team.

Once the editorial process is complete, reviewers will receive the editorial decision and, when appropriate, the anonymized reviewer comments provided to the authors.

Please remember that the final decision is made by the Editorial Board after consideration of the available peer-review reports and the manuscript as a whole.

13. Questions and Support

For questions regarding reviewer registration, OJS, journal policies, review assignments, or the peer-review process, please contact the Translation Editorial Team.

Thank you for contributing your time and expertise to the peer-review process. Your careful, objective, and constructive feedback helps Translation maintain high standards for scientific integrity and scholarly communication.