Instructions for Referees 2011

General
All articles submitted for publication in the Interdisciplinary Toxicology are independently refereed regardless of source. Manuscripts should be assessed on their scientific integrity and the significance of their contribution to knowledge. The author's opinions should be allowed to stand provided they are available with evidence, even though you may disagree with them.

A detailed checklist is provided to guide the review process. Please complete all sections of this and return it with a separately detailed critique of the manuscript. Where appropriate provide an introductory paragraph summarizing the major findings of the article with your overall impression of the paper, and highlighting the major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments, which may be divided into major and minor points.

You are not required to correct deficiencies of style, syntax, or grammar, but any help you can provide in clarifying meaning will be appreciated.

If you recommend that the article be rejected, please give specific reasons for your decision. The final decision concerning acceptability of a manuscript is the responsibility of the Editor.

Confidentiality
Manuscripts sent for review are privileged communications and must remain strictly confidential at all times. Referees must not copy, share or disclose the content of manuscripts to any other person except with the permission of the Editor, and must return or destroy manuscripts after submitting their reports. Referees must not use knowledge of the work, before or after publication, to further their own interests.

Conflict of Interest
Referees must disclose to the Editor any conflicts of interest or computing financial interests that could bias their opinions of the manuscript, and should disqualify themselves if they believe this to be appropriate. Competing financial interests include any financial holdings, professional affiliations, advisory positions, board memberships, or patent applications/holdings that may bear relationship to the submitted work. Please indicate on the "Checklist for Referees" whether conflicts do or do not exist and detail these separately as appropriate in your correspondence to the Editor.

Authors are required to state all sources of funding and financial support pertaining to the submitted research, including support in kind in the Acknowledgements section of the manuscript. They are also required to list the organizational affiliations of all authors including academic, corporate and other commercial entities that have any bearing on the study in the Acknowledgements section, or included in affiliations listed for each author as footnotes on the title page.

Anonymity
Referees shall remain anonymous, unless both the referee and the Editor agree otherwise.

Classes of articles
Review Articles provide expert summaries of current knowledge in a particular field. Review articles have no set format, but should generally contain an Abstract that clearly summarizes key points, a concise conclusion, Acknowledgements and References.

Original Articles report new and substantial contributions to toxicology/pharmacology science based on original research. They have the format: Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Acknowledgements and References.

Case Reports describe novel observations from clinical practice. The format may include Abstract, Introduction, Case History, Clinical Findings, Discussion, Acknowledgements and References.

Short Communications are vehicles for valuable but limited or preliminary observations. They generally have the same format as Original Articles.

Original Articles may be preliminary in nature, and report information of pressing importance. At the discretion of the Editorial Board, these will be published as soon as possible following peer review and should follow the format of Original Articles.

Aims
The aims, objectives or hypotheses tested should be clearly stated in the Abstract and at the end of the Introduction.

Materials and Methods
The following must be clearly described:
Selection of subjects: For experiments or field trials, the source and number of subjects (animals, groups, patients) in the study, the process for their selection and specific criteria for inclusion/exclusion. Procedures used to determine sample size should be described, preferably considering both study power and level of statistical significance in relation to anticipated biological outcomes.

Allocation to treatments: The method of randomization used to allocate subjects to treatment groups must be described. If stratification, blocking, or matching are involved, these should be clearly described and considered in the analysis and presentation of results.

Selection of analytical methods: All methods and procedures used in a research study or experiment should be appropriately described and provide detailed information on the equipment, materials, chemicals and variables. This section should provide enough information to allow other researchers to replicate experiment or study.

Statistical Analysis
Analytical methods: should be appropriate for the study design, and the unit of analysis (e.g. individual animal, group or pen, farm, etc) and outcome variables stated unambiguously. When several analytical methods are used, it should be clearly stated where each method was applied. Two-sided tests should be used unless a strong argument is presented to justify a one-sided test. Complex procedures should be explained in detail or referenced. Software packages used should be identified by name, version and supplier, e.g. SPSS version 9.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc, Chicago IL, USA).

Presentation
All items referred to in Materials and methods should be presented in Results and vice versa.

References
All articles cited in the text must be included in the References list and vice versa. Abstracts should not be cited as references. The use of "unpublished data" or "personal communications" is only permitted if these exist in written form, and these may be referred to in the text, but must not appear in the reference list. References to papers which have been accepted but not published should be cited as "in press", whereas papers which have been submitted but not accepted should be referred to as "unpublished data". Self-referencing to non-peer-reviewed sources is strongly discouraged.

Referees are asked to scrutinize the use of non-peer-reviewed references and make recommendations regarding their acceptability, and to suggest more appropriate references if these exist.

Manuscript review checklist for referees

Title: [ ] A. INTRODUCTION TO THE MANUSCRIPT
[ ] 1. Rationale for Study (need and significance)
[ ] 2. Research Question Identified
[ ] 3. Literature Reviewed and Organized
[ ] 4. Data Analysis (Description of Statistical Evaluation)

B. METHOD SECTION
[ ] 1. Description and Rationale
[ ] 2. Data Collection Procedures
[ ] 3. Data Analysis (Description of Statistical Evaluation)

C. RESULTS/DISCUSSION
[ ] 1. Evidence of Depth and Detail in Narrative of the Findings
[ ] 2. Descriptive Quality of Figures and Tables (if relevant)
[ ] 3. Findings Compared and Contrasted with Relevant Literature
[ ] 4. Conclusions Drawn Logically

D. MANUSCRIPT COMPONENTS
[ ] 1. Abstract
[ ] 2. Appropriateness of Title
[ ] 3. References

E. COMPOSITION
[ ] 1. Writing Style
[ ] 2. Grammar
[ ] 3. Citations/ Format (Consistency with Journal Format)

F. RECOMMENDATION
[ ] 1. Accept as it is
[ ] 2. Accept after minor revisions
[ ] 3. Accept after major revisions
[ ] 4. Reject

Please make explicit here the basis of the evaluation comments and final recommendation. Please, try to comment on specific issues that the author(s) can address directly.