

Peer Reviewer Instruction for EnM

1. Instructions for Peer Reviewers for Endocrinology and Metabolism

Thank you for volunteering to serve as a peer reviewer for *Endocrinology and Metabolism* (EnM). Your expertise and insights play an invaluable role in maintaining the quality and integrity of our publications. All manuscripts, including commissioned ones, undergo a rigorous peer-review process.

2. Single-Blind Peer Review

EnM uses a single-blind review system. In this system, reviewers remain anonymous, while they are aware of the authors' identities and affiliations. However, authors do not know the reviewers' identities.

3. Role of Reviewers

As a peer reviewer, your role is to provide constructive feedback to the editors regarding the manuscript's suitability for publication. Your assessments should be objective, well-reasoned, and clearly articulated. Key points to focus on include:

- **Scientific Soundness:** Evaluate the logical consistency of the study and the robustness of the statistical analysis.
- **Reporting Guidelines:** Use established reporting guidelines to inform your review.
- **Citations:** Note any relevant published work not cited by the authors.
- **Confidentiality:** Treat all content confidentially.

The editor-in-chief will make the final decision to accept or reject a manuscript based on your recommendations.

4. Review Timeline

If you are unable to complete your first review within 21 days, please either decline the invitation or request an extension. If no comments are received within 2 days of accepting the review invitation, a reminder will be sent.

5. Writing Review Comments

After logging into the e-submission system, download the manuscript and any supplementary files. Your comments should focus on the scientific content and logical interpretation of the results, rather than style or formatting.

- **Comments to Authors:** Summarize the manuscript in one sentence and provide specific comments for each section, using page numbers for clarity. Avoid indicating your recommendation for acceptance or rejection in this section.
- **Comments to the Editor:** Highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript.

Please consider the following guidelines when writing your comments:

- **Professionalism:** Treat authors with courtesy, respect, fairness, and professionalism.
- **Constructive Feedback:** Be specific, objective, and constructive in your reviews. Focus on how well the argument is supported rather than whether you agree with it. Comment on the performance, not the person.
- **Clarification and Improvement:** Raise objections or seek explanations to clarify and strengthen the manuscript. Provide guidance to help authors improve both the current submission and future work.

6. Ethical Guidelines for Reviewers

- **Confidentiality:** Maintain the confidentiality of all information acquired during the review process.
- **Conflicts of Interest:** Disclose any potential conflicts of interest, such as competitive relationships, financial interests, or personal antipathies. If any of these apply, you should decline to review, or if you would like to proceed, clearly disclose the conflict.
- **Use of Data:** Do not use any material or data from the manuscript under review. You may use open data from the manuscript after publication.

7. Post-Review Procedures

The editorial office may analyze reviewers' comments and recommendations while keeping reviewers' identities confidential. If you have any questions or require assistance, please contact the editorial office. Reviewers may be acknowledged in an editorial for their contributions.

8. Use of Artificial intelligence (AI) Tools

Reviewers must not use AI tools when evaluating a manuscript. Such tools compromise confidentiality and cannot replace expert judgment.

Thank you for your dedication to advancing the quality of medical research through your valuable contributions to our peer review process.