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**Reviewer Code of Conduct**

**Ethical guidelines for UEE peer reviewers**

All peer reviewers must follow these ethical guidelines:

1. Reviewers should provide the UEE editors with personal and professional information that is accurate and a true representation of their expertise.
2. Reviewers should only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner.
3. Reviewers should notify the journal immediately and seek advice if they discover either a conflicting interest that was not apparent when they agreed to the review or anything that might prevent them providing a fair and unbiased review.
4. Reviewers should make all reasonable effort to submit their report and recommendation on time. They should inform the editor if this is not possible.
5. Reviewers should contact the journal if circumstances arise that will prevent them from submitting a timely review, providing an accurate estimate of the time they will need to do a review if still asked to do so.
6. Reviewers should not agree to review a manuscript just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting a review.
7. Reviewers should provide a constructive, comprehensive, evidenced, and appropriately substantial comments.
8. Reviewers should not make unfair negative comments or include unjustified criticisms of any competitors’ work that is mentioned in the manuscript.
9. Reviewers must avoid making statements in their comments which might be construed as impugning any person’s reputation.
10. Reviewers should not suggest that authors include citations to the reviewer’s (or their associates’) work merely to increase the reviewer’s (or their associates’) citation count or to enhance the visibility of their or their associates’ work; suggestions must be based on valid academic reasons.
11. Confidential comments to the editor should not be a place for denigration or false accusation, done in the knowledge that the authors will not see these comments.
12. If reviewers suspect the identity of the author(s), they should not communicate directly with authors.
13. Reviewers must give unbiased consideration to each manuscript submitted. They should judge each on its merits, without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
14. Reviewers must keep the peer review process confidential. They must not share information or correspondence about a manuscript with anyone outside of the peer review process.
15. Reviewers should not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript, including junior researchers they are mentoring, without first obtaining permission from the journal editors.
16. Reviewers should not use information obtained during the peer-review process for their own or any other person’s or organization’s advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others.
17. Reviewers should call to the editors’ attention any significant similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or submitted manuscripts of which they are aware.
18. Reviewers should notify the UEE immediately if they come across any irregularities or have concerns about ethical aspects of the work.

## **Positive comments**

* *The manuscript is well written in an engaging and lively style.*
* *The level is appropriate to our readership.*
* *This manuscript ticks all the boxes we have in mind for a UEE article. I have no hesitation in recommending that it be accepted for publication after a few typos and other minor details have been attended to.*
* *Given the complexity involved, the author has produced many positive and welcome outcomes. The literature review offers a useful overview of current research and opinions, and the resulting bibliography provides a very useful resource for current practitioners.*

## **Constructive criticism**

* *I would have wished to see more information on…*
* *I do not think that this article covers the different viewpoints that exist around X*
* *I would strongly advise the author to rewrite their section Y, to include more information on….*
* *The author could strengthen the article by…*
* *The article would be significantly improved with the addition of more details about…*
* *The abstract is very lengthy and goes into detailed accounts that are best suited for the article’s main discussion sections. As such, I suggest the author reduces this section to keep only the most important elements.*
* *To make this entry publishable, the author needs to respond to the following substantive points…*

## **Linguistic alterations**

* *The paper would benefit from stylistic changes to the way it has been written for a stronger, clearer, and more compelling argument.*
* *There are a few sentences that need rephrasing for clarity.*