

# **RSC Advances**

# RSC Advances Reviewer Panel Member

#### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

## **Role**

To be a member of the RSC Advances Reviewer Panel and provide reviews for the journal.

You will be invited by Associate Editors to review submissions in your selected area(s) of expertise. Associate Editors will use your chosen areas of expertise, along with subject areas provided by authors during submission of their manuscript, to invite you to review suitable manuscripts.

#### **Responsibilities of a Reviewer Panel Member**

- 1. To act as a reviewer for *RSC Advances*. Panel members can expect to receive, on average two manuscripts to review per month within their field of expertise.
- 2. To advise and assist the *RSC Advances* Associate Editors in assessing manuscripts against the publication criteria of the Journal (see below) and to recommend suitable papers for publication in *RSC Advances*.
- 3. To provide a recommendation and report via the manuscript processing system within the timeframe specified on the reviewer invitation email.
- 4. To provide advice to the *RSC Advances* Associate Editors on borderline papers and act as adjudicator in cases involving conflicting reviewer reports and appeals where appropriate.
- 5. To inform the Associate Editor, by responding appropriately to the reviewer invitation, if a manuscript sent to you for review cannot be assessed for any reason (including conflicts of interest) and where possible suggest an alternative member of the Reviewer Panel.
- 6. To notify the Editorial Office, in advance, of any significant periods of time that you will be unavailable for reviewing.
- 7. To keep your research interests and keywords updated *via* the manuscript processing system (http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rscadv).
- 8. To remain aware of their own unconscious biases and be as objective as possible; the following video by the Royal Society provides basic information on unconscious bias: <a href="Understanding unconscious bias"><u>Understanding unconscious bias</u></a>

## Criteria for publication in RSC Advances

When assessing articles for publication in RSC Advances, please consider the following:

- Does the work present a significant advance over the existing literature? Is the advance clearly highlighted in the main article?
- Is the work of interest or relevance to the chemistry community?
- Has sufficient evidence/data been provided to support the conclusions of the work? Is the data provided robust and authentic?
- Has adequate characterisation data been provided for any materials/compounds that are reported? For full details, please see the "Characterisation of new compounds" section within our Journal's webpage here: <a href="https://rsc.li/rsc-advances">https://rsc.li/rsc-advances</a>





- Are the results discussed in the context of the literature?
- Are the references relevant and do they appropriately reflect the existing literature?
- Do the figures and tables in the paper assist the reader in understanding the work? Are the structures of any compounds presented accurately drawn?

#### **Ethical standards**

Reviewers should notify the Associate Editor of any conflicts of interest, such as previous or ongoing work relationships with the authors.

When reviewing, reviewers should notify the Associate Editor of any potential misconduct, including but not limited to plagiarism, duplicate publication or data fabrication.

# **Recognition of services**

As member of the RSC Advances Reviewer Panel your name will be displayed on the Journal's website.

In recognition of the service you are providing, members of the *RSC Advances* Reviewer Panel will be issued with a certificate at the end of each year highlighting the valuable contribution you have made to the Journal.

# **Term**

Membership of the Reviewer Panel commences from the date of your enrolment. If you wish to resign from the Reviewer Panel please contact the Editorial Office.

The Editorial Office will review your membership against the responsibilities listed above on an annual basis.

# **Code of conduct**

Reviewers should not use any abusive language or make personal attacks on authors.

All reviewers should comply with our code of conduct and ethical responsibilities.

#### **Queries**

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact the Editorial Office at:

advances-rsc@rsc.org - for queries regarding this role; or advances@rsc.org - for all queries relating to specific manuscripts or using ScholarOne.