

# RUBBER CHEMISTRY AND TECHNOLOGY

## Reviewer Guidelines

- 1) Our Mission: "to render available in convenient form important and permanently valuable papers from across the international scientific community on fundamental research, technical developments, and chemical engineering relating to rubber and its allied substances."
- 2) Our Scope: the journal publishes fundamental and applied research on the chemistry, mechanics, and materials science of elastomers, as well as emerging developments on topics such as biomaterials, sustainability and simulation.
- 3) Purpose of Peer Review.
  - a) Champion the reader's perspective and interests, identifying opportunities for authors to better serve readers through manuscript improvements.
  - b) Engage the author with constructive, specific, and actionable criticism aimed at advancing the work and the overall professional field
  - c) Provide perspective to Editors on the merits and weaknesses of the assigned manuscript.
- 4) Procedure
  - a) Please note that your identity will be held strictly confidential.
  - b) Log into the online system and confirm your availability to provide a review at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/rct/default.aspx>. Please respond to review invitation within 3 to 4 weeks. If you are unable to accept at this time, consider recommending to us a qualified colleague who could make the review.
  - c) Evaluate the manuscript against the given quality standards (see table below). Include a brief summary of your view on the value of the contribution and identify ways the author could improve the work.
  - d) Return your review before the due date via the online editorial system - <https://www.editorialmanager.com/rct/default.aspx>
- 5) Reviewer Tips
  - a) If you perceive a conflict of interest or expertise mismatch in your serving as a reviewer for this paper, please immediately notify the Editor so that an alternative reviewer can be identified.
  - b) Identify and articulate in one or two sentences what is most valuable in the paper.
  - c) Consider how the paper will be understood by average and expert readers.
  - d) Keep comments purposeful and actionable. Avoid vague or subjective comments. Identify errors and weaknesses but keep criticism respectful and professional.
  - e) Number comments so that they can be referenced during the revision process.
  - f) Reference subject locations in the manuscript so that they can be easily identified. Example: "Page 4, Paragraph 3, – the explanation is unclear. Please define ...".
- 6) Language Standard
  - a) Minor deviations from native English language usage and construction are acceptable, so long as technical meaning of the paper's important points are clearly discernible.
  - b) In cases where language issues obscure important points, but a reviewer believes there is probably scientific value in the paper, the reviewer can invite the author to seek assistance with rendering the paper in English, and to resubmit the paper.
  - c) If the reviewer can make no judgment about scientific value due to language issues, then the paper should be released.

Quality Standard	Comments
<p><b>Title and Abstract</b> Title and abstract should clearly and concisely convey the paper's value, scope, approach and significant results.</p>	
<p><b>Technical / Scientific Value</b> The manuscript must have a legitimate scientific purpose that is consistent with journal aims and scope. It should not have a primarily commercial purpose, and it should approach the subject objectively.</p>	
<p><b>Innovation</b> The approach and / or results should advance the field in an identifiable way. Prior work in the field should be adequately reviewed and cited. The work should not have been published elsewhere.</p>	
<p><b>Accuracy</b> The paper should not contain known errors. Methods should be appropriate to objectives pursued. Conclusions should be adequately supported by the results.</p>	
<p><b>Effective Communication</b> All terms and symbols must be adequately defined. Jargon should be minimized. Figures and tables should be of acceptable quality, with each cited in the text. Superfluous content should be avoided. Language, syntax and punctuation should be appropriate. SI Units should be used throughout. Length of paper should be appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>Your recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept As Is</li> <li>• Accept After Minor Revisions</li> <li>• Invite Revision and Resubmission</li> <li>• Do Not Publish</li> </ul>