1. REVIEW POLICIES

Peer reviewers are experts chosen by editors to provide written assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of written research, with the aim of improving the reporting of research and identifying the most appropriate and highest quality material for the journal. Regular reviewers selected for the journal should be required to meet minimum standards (as determined and promulgated by each journal) regarding their background in original research, publication of articles, formal training, and previous critical appraisal of manuscripts. Peer reviewers should be experts in the scientific topic addressed in the articles they review, and should be selected for their objectivity and scientific knowledge.

Reviews will be expected to be professional, honest, courteous, prompt, and constructive. The desired major elements of a high-quality review should be as follows:

- The reviewer should have identified and commented on major strengths and weaknesses of study design and methodology
- The reviewer should comment accurately and constructively upon the quality of the author's interpretation of the data, including acknowledgment of its limitations
- The reviewer should comment on major strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript as a written communication, independent of the design, methodology, results, and interpretation of the study
- The reviewer should comment on any ethical concerns raised by the study, or any possible evidence of low standards of scientific conduct
- The reviewer should provide the author with useful suggestions for improvement of the manuscript.
- The reviewer's comments to the author should be constructive and professional
- The review should provide the editor the proper context and perspective to make a decision on acceptance (and/or revision) of the manuscript

The submitted manuscript is a privileged communication; reviewers must treat it as confidential. It should not be retained or copied. Also, reviewers must not share the manuscript with any colleagues without the explicit permission of the editor. Reviewers and editors must not make any personal or professional use of the data, arguments, or interpretations (other than those directly involved in its peer review) prior to publication unless they have the authors' specific permission or are writing an editorial or commentary to accompany the article.

If reviewers suspect misconduct, they should notify the editor in confidence, and should not share their concerns with other parties unless officially notified by the journal that they may do so.

2. HOW TO USE THE SYSTEM

2.1 How to accept/decline the review requests and consult reviewer guidelines

When you are assigned as a Reviewer, you receive a 'REVIEW REQUEST' email message with the link to the submission: you don't need to enter your Username and Password, because simply clicking on the same link you can access the review page. In the e-mail you receive, you will also see the deadline to accept/decline our request and the deadline for completing the review.

Should you be overcommitted and have to decline our request, please inform us that you need to be replaced. In that case, a suggestion for other suitable and reliable reviewers with sufficient experience in the field is much appreciated.

To accept/decline the review request, follow the instructions below:
   a) click on the URL provided in the 'Review request' message
   b) from the webpage you are redirected to, you can see several review steps: **Step 1** requires you to accept or refuse the assignment. The system allows you to read the title and the abstract of the paper and reminds you of the deadlines to be respected (Fig 1)
   c) after reading and accepting our 'privacy' and 'conflict of interest' policies, at the bottom of the webpage you will find two buttons to accept or decline our request for review (Fig 2). Only if you accept, are you allowed to see and download the whole paper.
   d) once you have agreed to perform the review, in **Step 2**, you will have the opportunity to consult the detailed guidelines for reviewers (Fig 3). Click on the button "CONTINUE TO STEP 3" (bottom page) to access the paper (Fig 3).

Fig 1

Fig 2

Fig 3

2.2 How to download the paper and upload your comments

In **Step 3**, you will be able to download the submission file (and other materials that may have been uploaded) (Fig 4a).

When you have finished your review, you will be required to upload your comments. The system distinguishes between comments for the author and comments that only the editor(s) can read. Also, you can have the chance (optional) to upload a file to be shared with the authors (in this case, be sure to remove your name or other indications that would make your identity known) (Fig 4b).

As the final step, you will be required to select your recommended editorial decision:
    Accept Submission
    Decline Submission
    Revisions Required (= minor revisions),
    Resubmit for Review (= major revisions)
    Resubmit Elsewhere

Click on the button "SUBMIT REVIEW" to complete your task (Fig 4c).

Fig 4a

Review: *Human Papillomavirus Infection, an Assessment of Awareness, Knowledge, Attitude among University of Johannesburg Students.*

1. Request   **2. Guidelines**   **3. Download & Review**   **4. Completion**

Review Files   click on the file(s) to download it / them

📄 4822-1   Author, I.T Ncube 216089741Article 2.docx   Article Text

Fig 4b

Review
Enter (or paste) your review of this submission into the form below.

your comments

For author and editor

your comments

For editor only

Upload
Upload files you would like the editor and/or author to consult, including revised versions of the original review file(s).

use this to upload files

Reviewer Files   Q Search   **Upload File**

No Files

Fig 4c

Recommendation   Select your recommendation
Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Revisions Required

Submit Review   **Go Back**

*Denotes required field