

## Reviewer instructions

Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs

Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs follows the [Farmington Consensus](#). We will thus ask our referees to declare any conflict of interests in connection with the text you are asked to comment upon (in the text box for comments to the editor). Please observe that the article shall be treated with full confidentiality and must not be quoted before it is published. Below you will find a short basic guide on questions concerning the review process. For more information, please consult the chapter on reviewing manuscripts for scientific journals in [Publishing Addiction Science: A Guide for the Perplexed](#) as well as the ethical guidelines of Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs.

### Before deciding on whether to review

After receiving an invitation, you (usually) have 10 days to either accept or decline and 28 days to review a manuscript. The invitation only includes basic information about the manuscript (title and abstract). After accepting, you will be able to access the complete manuscript through our editorial system.

We encourage you to respond promptly to invitations to review. If you have to decline the invitation, we highly appreciate suggestions of other potential reviewers.

Reviewers should decline to review if there is a clear conflict of interest. You should also decline if you are unable to write an unbiased review, if you deem you are not familiar enough with the research topic, if you have reviewed the manuscript before, or if you are unable to meet the deadline.

Please contact the editors if you wish to review but need an extension on the review deadline. Also contact the editors if you are unsure whether it is appropriate for you to review the manuscript.

### Technical obstacles, conflict of interest and suspicions of misconduct

Please contact the editors if there are any unforeseen circumstances that make it impossible for you to complete the review, or if you cannot complete it within the agreed time-frame.

If you discover, after accessing the complete manuscript, that there exists a conflict of interest which potentially makes you an unsuitable reviewer, contact the editors so that we can discuss its nature and possibly start the process of finding a replacement.

Do not hesitate to contact the editors during the review process if you have the slightest suspicion of ethical or scientific misconduct (e.g. suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, or problematic treatment of the research subjects).

### Writing the review

Reviewers should provide speedy, accurate, courteous, unbiased and justifiable reports. Reviews should be submitted online (<http://www.editorialmanager.com/nad/default.asp>). In our editorial system you will find four elements that need to be filled in, in order to be able to submit the review:

- a text box for confidential comments to the editor
- a text box for comments to the author
- a report form on the merits of the manuscript
- a drop down menu for an overall recommendation.

In the comments to the editors please provide observations on the analytical rigor and on the importance of the information in the manuscript. Does it cover new ground or apply a novel perspective? How much work does the manuscript need before it can be published?

In the comments to the author please state the paper's main strengths and weaknesses and provide specific suggestions for improvements. Try to be critical but not condescending. The review should provide a detailed critique based on the technical rigor and novelty of the manuscript. Here are some examples of relevant questions:

- To what extent do the data and methods substantiate the discussion and conclusions?
- Is additional information needed to validate the interpretations?
- Are the conclusions similar to work already published?

The manuscript rating questions may also be helpful when writing the review. Please note that you will not be able to submit the review if you haven't filled in this form.

- Is the article suitable for publication in NAD?
- Does it give new, valuable knowledge in its field of research?
- Does the text have a clear structure?
- Are the concepts and terminology consistent and adequate?
- Does it give a clear description of the data and methods used?
- Are the hypotheses and theories of the article scientifically valid?
- Are the title and the abstract in concordance with the content of the article?
- Are the tables and figures concise/explicit and relevant for the article?
- Are the references relevant and sufficient?

In the drop down menu you will be able to make your overall publication recommendation: accept, minor revision, major revision or reject.

### **Confidentiality**

We do not reveal the identity of our reviewers and expect our reviewers to protect the confidentiality of the manuscript and maintain confidentiality in the review process. Reviewers should never disseminate the content or even existence of the manuscript before its publication.

### **Editor's decision**

When the editors have made a final decision concerning the manuscript you will be able to access the other reviewers' comments to the author.