

Guidelines for Reviewers

Updated: 9-04-2025

1. Peer Review and Editorial Procedure

Peer review is an indispensable part of the publication process, ensuring that the journal maintains the highest quality standards for its published papers. All manuscripts submitted to this journal undergo rigorous peer review by experts.

Upon submission, the journal's Managing Editor conducts a technical pre-check of the manuscript. A suitable academic editor is then notified and invited to perform an editorial pre-check and recommend reviewers. The academic editor may decide to proceed with peer review, reject the manuscript, or request revisions prior to peer review. If peer review is initiated, the Editorial Office organizes the review process, engaging independent experts to provide at least two review reports per manuscript. Authors are required to make sufficient revisions (with a second round of peer review if necessary) before a final decision is made. The final decision rests with an academic editor (typically the Editor-in-Chief, an Editorial Board Member, or a Guest Editor for Special Issues). Accepted manuscripts undergo internal copyediting and English language polishing. For more details on the editorial process, please visit here (<https://ccspub.cc/jrcc/EP>).

2. Reviewer Qualifications and Responsibilities

The role of the reviewer is critical in safeguarding the integrity of scholarly records. Reviewers are expected to evaluate manuscripts in a timely, transparent, and ethical manner, adhering to COPE guidelines (https://publicationethics.org/files/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers-v2_0.pdf).

Reviewers must meet the following criteria:

- No conflicts of interest with any of the authors;
- Not affiliated with the same institution as the authors;
- No co-authorship with any of the authors within the past three years;
- Hold a PhD (or MD for medical journals);
- Possess relevant expertise and a demonstrated publication record in the manuscript's field (e.g., Scopus, ORCID);
- Be an experienced scholar in the manuscript's subject area;
- Maintain a formal and recognized academic affiliation.

Reviewers who accept an invitation are expected to:

- Have the necessary expertise to assess the manuscript's scientific quality;

- Provide high-quality review reports and remain responsive throughout the peer review process;
- Uphold professional and ethical standards.

3. Reviewer Benefits

Reviewers will receive remuneration (subject to funding availability) and enjoy priority access to academic events organized by CCSpub.

4. General Guidelines for Reviewers

4.1 Review Invitation

Manuscripts submitted to the journal are reviewed by at least two experts recommended by the academic editor during the initial screening. Reviewers are tasked with evaluating the manuscript's quality and advising the Editorial Office on whether to accept, request revisions, or reject the submission.

Invited reviewers are requested to:

- Accept or decline invitations as soon as possible (based on the manuscript title and abstract);
- Suggest alternative reviewers if declining an invitation;
- Request a deadline extension promptly if additional time is needed to prepare a comprehensive report.

4.2 Potential Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers must declare any potential conflicts of interest and contact the Editorial Office if uncertain whether a situation constitutes a conflict. Possible conflicts include (but are not limited to):

- Affiliation with the same institution as any author;
- Co-authorship, collaboration, joint funding, or other academic ties with any author within the past three years;
- Close personal relationships, rivalries, or animosities with any author;
- Financial gains or losses resulting from the manuscript's publication;
- Non-financial conflicts (political, personal, religious, ideological, academic, intellectual, commercial, etc.).

Reviewers must disclose any perceived biases for or against the manuscript or its authors. *Note:* Reviewing a manuscript previously assessed for another journal is *not* considered a conflict of interest. In such cases, reviewers may inform the Editorial Office whether the

manuscript has improved compared to the prior version. Reviewers are encouraged to consult COPE's *Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers*.

4.3 Confidentiality Agreement

The journal employs a double-blind peer review system. Until publication, reviewers must keep all manuscript content (including abstracts) confidential. Reviewers must avoid revealing their identity in comments or document metadata (e.g., in Word or PDF files). If a reviewer delegates the task to a colleague, the Editorial Office must be notified (the substitute must meet the criteria in Section 2).

Authors may opt to publish review reports alongside their paper (*Open Peer Review*), but only with the reviewer's explicit permission. Otherwise, reports remain confidential unless disclosure is approved by the reviewer.

4.4 Review Reports

Review reports must be submitted in **Chinese or English**. Below are general guidelines:

Instructions for Reviewers:

- Read the entire manuscript and supplementary materials (if applicable).
- Critically evaluate the full paper, including specific sections and key concepts.
- Provide detailed comments to help authors address your concerns.
- Do **not** recommend citations of your own work, colleagues' work, other authors, or the journal unless *essential* to improving the manuscript.
- Avoid excessive self-citations, honorary citations, or journal citations to inflate metrics. References should only be suggested if they significantly enhance the manuscript.
- Maintain a neutral tone and offer constructive criticism. Derogatory remarks will not be tolerated.
- **Prohibition of AI Tools:**
 - Do **not** use generative AI or large language models (LLMs) to draft review reports. Reviewers are solely responsible for report content.
 - Limited use for grammar/structure corrections is permissible but must be disclosed upon submission.
 - Uploading any part of the manuscript (text, figures, tables, etc.) to AI tools violates CCSpub's confidentiality policy. Reports violating this rule will be discarded.

Note: CCSpub adheres to multiple publishing standards. Reviewers familiar with these guidelines should report any concerns about their implementation.

Structure of Review Reports:

1. **Brief Summary:** A short paragraph outlining the paper's objectives, key contributions, and strengths.
2. **General Comments:**
 - *Research Articles:* Highlight weaknesses, methodological inaccuracies, missing controls, etc.
 - *Review Articles:* Assess topic coverage, relevance, reference appropriateness, etc.
3. **Specific Comments:** Cite line numbers, tables, or figures to pinpoint inaccuracies or unclear text. Focus on scientific content (language/formatting issues will be handled separately).

Guiding Questions for Research Articles:

- Is the manuscript clear, well-structured, and relevant to the field?
- Is the research question specific? Are the conclusions reliable and innovative?
- Are cited references adequate and supportive of the conclusions?
- Are methods, perspectives, and theories appropriate?

Guiding Questions for Review Articles:

- Is the review comprehensive, clear, and relevant?
- Have similar reviews been published recently? Does this review add value?
- Are statements and conclusions logically supported by references?

4.5 Manuscript Rating

Reviewers must complete the evaluation form and rate the manuscript.

4.6 Final Recommendation

Provide one of the following recommendations (visible only to editors):

- **Accept:** Publish without revisions.
- **Minor:** Accept after minor edits per reviewer comments.
- **Major:** Reconsider after significant revisions. Authors must respond point-by-point or justify unaddressed comments. Maximum two revision rounds.
- **Reject:** Serious flaws; no original contribution; no resubmission offered.

All decisions must be thoroughly justified.

Reviewer Website Operation Guide

When you are invited as an external reviewer to evaluate a manuscript for our journal, you will receive an email from Notice@ccspub.cc with the subject line "Invitation to Review."

After receiving the invitation email, please click the "Accept or Decline" link in the email and choose either "Accept" or "Decline" based on your availability.

If you choose "Accept," you will be redirected to our journal's website system via the provided link.

1. **Request:** Provides the title, abstract, and full text of the article you are to review, along with the review deadline. Please download the full text for evaluation.
2. **Guidelines:** Offers detailed reviewing guidelines. Alternatively, you may visit: <https://ccspub.cc/jrcc/reviewer>
3. **Download & Review:** Please upload your review comments. You may copy the review form provided on the website system or directly download and use the [review form](#).

Thank you for your support!

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our staff.

Email: office@ccspub.cc