

## **Reviewer Guidelines for *Ergonomics in Design***

Your service as a reviewer for *Ergonomics in Design* is greatly appreciated. The peer-review process allows authors to achieve top-quality publications, and allows science to flourish. This document contains guidelines and suggestions for completing your review. Another useful set of guidelines is "Twelve Tips for Reviewers" (Roediger, 2007), which may be [found here](#).

If you have questions concerning writing or submitting your review, please contact the Editor who invited you to review the paper.

### **Ethics**

Reviewers are obligated to keep the manuscript and its content confidential. In addition, reviewers should not review papers that present a conflict of interest. Please do not review papers written by colleagues at your institution, former students or mentors, or current collaborators.

Reviewers are also required to follow the [HFES Code of Ethics](#).

### **Timeliness**

It is essential that reviews are submitted by the due date so that we can provide timely feedback to the authors. Please contact the Editor immediately if you cannot meet the deadline. Under certain conditions, the review due date can be extended within reason.

### **Submitting Your Review in Manuscript Central**

You may prepare your comments in a document editor and copy/paste it into the appropriate window in the online Reviewer Center. Please do not attach your review as a document because anonymity cannot be ensured.

*Ergonomics in Design* uses a single-blind review system (reviewers' identities are concealed; authors are identified). If you wish to reveal your identity to the author (and other reviewers), you may include your name in your review comments.

The box labeled "Comments to the Editor" can be used to provide comments that are only seen by the editor. *While in the Reviewer Center, please update your contact information and areas of expertise (keywords used to assign reviewers to papers).*

### **Content and Structure**

*Scope.* Reviewers should focus primarily on evaluating the science, innovation, and clarity in the manuscript rather than on fit or editorial issues. It is not necessary to point out all of the spelling and grammatical errors. Before assigning reviewers, Editors have assessed whether the topic is suitable for *Ergonomics in Design*; whether the paper is free of language, writing, and organizational issues; and whether the length and format of the paper conform to the guidelines for *Ergonomics in Design*.

*Content.* The standard of quality for the journal is very high, with about 80% of new submissions rejected. To maintain this standard, we ask for reviews that are critical, conscientious, and detailed and that provide developmental and constructive feedback aimed toward improving the quality of the work.

*Tone.* Criticism should be constructive rather than rude or demeaning, which can discourage authors. If you must use harsh words, address them only in the box labeled "COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR." The editorial board strives to provide authors with a positive and helpful review experience. Try to mention strengths of the paper rather than solely enumerating flaws.

*Organization.* It is very helpful to authors and editors when reviewers separate and number their comments consecutively throughout a review. This helps the authors communicate their responses to the reviewers' comments when submitting a revision.

### **Reviewing a Revision**

Please inform the Editor if you are having difficulty reviewing a paper because you have reviewed it before and are experiencing "reviewer fatigue." We want to avoid recommendations of acceptance simply because the paper has been improved since the last review(s). All papers that are published must meet our absolute standard of quality for the journal.