



## **Journal of Small Satellites (JoSS)**

### **Guidelines for Reviewers**

In addition to the following standards, Reviewers are encouraged and expected to read the [JoSS Publishing Ethics and Malpractice Statement](#) (PEMS) and the Summary of the [JoSS Publication Process](#), to familiarize themselves with their functional roles and ethical responsibilities.

#### **Contribution to Editorial Decisions**

Peer review assists the Technical Area Editors (TAEs) and other Editors in making their publishing decisions and, through editorial communications with authors, may assist authors in improving their manuscripts. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of scientific endeavor. JoSS shares the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to the scientific process have an obligation to conduct a fair share of reviewing.

#### **Promptness**

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should immediately notify JoSS Staff and decline the invitation to review so that an alternative Reviewer can be contacted.

#### **Confidentiality**

Any manuscripts received for review are confidential documents and must be treated as such; they must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the Editor-in-Chief (EiC), who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances. This applies also to invited Reviewers who decline the review invitation. Similarly, Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author and the EiC.

#### **Standards of Objectivity and Comprehensiveness of the Review**

Reviews should be conducted objectively, without bias or prejudice, and observations should be formulated clearly with supporting arguments so that authors can use them for improving the manuscript. Personal criticism of the authors is inappropriate.

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications should be accompanied by the relevant (and accurate) citation. A Reviewer should also notify the TAEs of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other manuscript (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.

Reviewers should explain and support their judgments adequately so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.

A Reviewer should be alert to failure of authors to cite relevant work by other scientists. A Reviewer should call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper, or to any manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal, and, in the interest of avoiding the publication of potentially plagiarized material, the Reviewer is responsible for checking (using software, if, in the Reviewer's discretion, it would be appropriate) for instances of plagiarism.

### **Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest**

A Reviewer should be sensitive even to the appearance of a conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is closely related to the Reviewer's work in progress or published. Any invited Reviewer who has conflicts of interest, or is in doubt about such conflict resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the Authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscript and the work described therein should immediately notify the Editors through JoSS Staff for clarification or to declare their conflicts of interest and decline the invitation to review so that an alternative Reviewer can be identified, contacted, and secured.

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a Reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the authors, or the Editors, in the case of a JoSS-published article (as copyright has been transferred by the author at that point).

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for the Reviewer's personal advantage. This applies also to invited Reviewers who decline the invitation to provide a peer review.