

Standards for the Annals Review

The goal of the *Annals of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology* is to publish manuscripts that advance the knowledge of clinical allergy-immunology to ultimately improve management of these diseases. The *Annals* Editors typically utilize the opinions of at least two reviewers to judge each manuscript's quality and merits for publication. Reviewers are chosen for their expertise in the subject matter of the manuscript – therefore, their thoughtful opinions are valued as essential to the peer review process. *Annals* reviewers are active and enthusiastic clinicians and investigators in the field of allergy and clinical immunology, and the continuing success of the *Annals* publication process depends greatly on their commitment and expertise.

The manuscripts sent for review should be considered privileged information and are to be treated as confidential documents. They should only be shared or discussed with others for the expressed purpose of obtaining assistance in reaching an editorial recommendation. It is the reviewer's responsibility to solicit only from colleagues who will respect confidentiality. In no case should a reviewer communicate with authors in any fashion.

It is important to remember that manuscripts that challenge conventional wisdom may provide new insights or be cutting edge in thinking. Thus, each manuscript should be judged on its own scientific and/or clinical merit within the context of acceptable scientific thought whether or not the reviewer agrees with this thought process. Papers should be rated on:

1. Novelty and originality
2. Importance of the topic to practicing allergists-immunologists
3. Strength of the experimental design and statistical analysis (where applicable)
4. Grammatically correct with appropriate brevity
5. Adequacy of the references
6. Relevance and priority of the information to the Journal's readership

The *Annals* uses a rating scale of 1-5 for evaluating manuscripts: 1 is the lowest rating; 5 is the highest. To achieve acceptance, a manuscript must receive an overall score of at least 3 (historically, only 50% of submitted manuscripts have been deemed of sufficient novelty, relevance and quality for acceptance).

The blinded Reviewer Comments to Authors should be written in an objective voice and should not express opinions on the paper's merit or worthiness for publication. Concerns about the science, style, length, and originality should be addressed here. Generally, the reviewer may recommend accept, revisions (major or minor) or reject. The review should be adequate to defend the recommended decision. Generally, a one or two sentence review is ***not*** acceptable.

Because of the desire to provide timely decision for the authors (which significantly affects the quality and quantity of submitted manuscripts), it is essential that reviews be done and transmitted in a timely fashion – generally two weeks or less. If a reviewer has conflicts that would significantly impair his/her ability to comply with this deadline, he/she should so inform the Editor making the request for review and decline the invitation for that manuscript. In like fashion, if a reviewer initially accepts the invitation and has a manuscript assigned for review then subsequently discovered that he/she will not be able to meet the review deadline, the reviewer should inform the editorial staff as soon as possible so that the manuscript can be reassigned. Such action will serve the editorial process much better than accepting an invitation then not being responsive to the established deadlines.

When the review is completed, the reviewer should submit his/her review electronically through Editorial Manager. Instructions for the submission process are provided through an email when the invitation to review is accepted, and are also available on the review submission screen in Editorial Manager. Any record of the manuscript (including hard copies and electronic files) should be destroyed by the reviewer as soon as the review has been submitted. When the Editors make a decision on the manuscript, the decision letter and all reviewer comments will be available by logging into Editorial Manager and accessing Completed Reviews on the Reviewer Main Menu.