REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

MANUSCRIPT CATEGORIES

Editorial

Editorials are contributed by recognized leader(s) in the field, solicited by the Editor-in-Chief and Associate Editors. Length should be 2,000 words maximum for the main text with no more than 25 references and no more than 2 figures/tables. No abstracts are required.

Research Article

Research Articles are those describing original research. Abstract is limited to 250 words. The main text should be structured in sections including introduction, materials and methods, results and discussions, conclusions, acknowledgments, conflict of interest, and author contributions, followed by references, and supporting information if any. Typically, at least 5 figures should be contained to form a coherent story centered on the important findings of the research with a length of 5000–8000 words.

Communication

Communications are reports of original research that are highly innovative and time-sensitive. They are structured similarly with Research Articles but are generally shorter focused on validation of concepts, usually containing no more than 3 figures and 4000 words.

Review

Reviews are timely, in-depth discussions of particular fields of choices. They should provide general overviews of the selected topics, including summaries of recent developments, discussions of their importance, perspectives of future advancements, and guidance to the relevant literature. Manuscripts should be at least 5000 words and less than 10000 words, while exceptions for longer contributions may be made at discretion of Editor-in-Chief. Passport-type photos and short biographies (75 words maximum) of up to 3 authors can be included. Reviews are generally solicited by the editors, but unsolicited contributions may be considered if the qualities meet the requirement of the journal. Both solicited and unsolicited review articles will undergo the peer review process prior to acceptance.

Mini-Review

Mini-Reviews are short reviews usually focusing on timely topics of interest. Manuscripts should be no more than 3000 words and 50 references. A passport-type photo and short biography (75 words maximum) of the corresponding authors may be included. Mini-Reviews are generally solicited by the editors, but unsolicited contributions may be considered if the qualities meet the requirement of the journal. Both solicited and unsolicited review articles will undergo the peer review process prior to acceptance.

Progress Report

Progress Reports highlight recent progresses in the authors' own research groups. Manuscripts do not have word limit but they should reflect comprehensive analyses of the research groups' recent contributions to the respective fields. Passport-type photos and short biographies (75 words maximum) of up to 3 authors can be included. Progress Reports are solicited by the editors and unsolicited contributions will not be considered.

REVIEW PROCESS

a) Editors of MPS first evaluate submitted manuscripts. If the manuscripts do not meet the standards of the journal as determined by the editors, they may be directly rejected without further reviews. Those judged to be of potential interest of the journal are sent to two to five reviewers for evaluation.

b) Reviewers can suggest whether the manuscripts should be published, revised, or rejected, by evaluating their significance, innovation, technical quality, and data presentation, among others.

c) The editors assess the reviewers' reports and make a final decision on each manuscript, which may typically include one of the following conditions: i) accept without further changes; ii) provisionally accept with minor revisions; iii) revise to address the concerns of the reviewers before

a final decision is made; iv) reject and reconsider if significant improvement in quality is shown; v) reject without further consideration.

While the editors' decision may be affected by many factors, the reviewers' suggestions are seriously considered; in certain cases the editors may override a particular reviewer's suggestion, which however, does not imply any negative indication on the reviewer's scientific judgement. In other cases where the editors receive conflicting reports from the reviewers, additional adjustive reports may be requested from more reviewers.

The reviewers may be asked to review subsequent versions of a manuscript by which was originally evaluated by the reviewers. In such cases copies of all reviewers' reports are usually sent to the reviewers without disclosing the information.

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

MPS publishes papers of high scientific impact and innovation in the field. Reviewers should provide unbiased, specific, and as detailed as possible reports on the scientific merits of the manuscripts while avoiding any personal criticism. Attempts to reveal reviewers' identities are also strongly discouraged. A reviewer's report should attempt to incorporate the following elements where applicable:

Summary of the Manuscript
A brief summary of the manuscript should be provided to describe the overview of the work, including its significance and innovation appropriate for publication in the journal.

Quality of the Scientific Work
Ideally, itemized comments should be delivered by the reviewer to evaluate the scientific quality of the work. Considerations may include but are not limited to:
a) Is the manuscript among the top 30% among those that the review has reviewed for journals alike?
b) Is the work original, or is it merely an addition to an already well-established prior art?

c) Are the results consistent, and are the conclusions supported by the data presented?

Quality of the Technical Work
Itemized comments should be delivered by the reviewer to evaluate the technical quality of the work. Considerations may include but are not limited to:
a) Are the experiments well-designed with proper controls?
b) Are the statistical analyses acceptable with satisfactory sample sizes?
c) Are figures, tables, and videos (if applicable) properly arranged?
d) Are the materials and methods adequately described for reproduction of the work by other researchers?

Quality of the Presentation
Itemized comments should be delivered by the reviewer to evaluate the quality of data presentation of the work. Considerations may include but are not limited to:
a) Are the figures, tables, and videos (if applicable) well-presented with sufficient clarity for the readers to comprehend?
b) Is the flow of the presentation logical?
c) Is the presentation clear and unbiased?
d) Is the language satisfactory or does it require further editing?

Ethics
The review should also identify the potential ethical issues associated with the manuscript, including evidences of plagiarism, dual publication, conflict of interest, and non-compliance with data generate from animals and human subjects.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

For more information, please visit journal home page at:
http://mps.amegroups.com
Email: mps@amegroups.com