Reviewers Instructions for the INTERPRAEVENT congresses

Purpose of Peer Review

The purpose of scientific journal peer review is to:

- provide the editors and the editorial committee with objective, unbiased advice about the quality and scientific, educational, and practical merit of a manuscript; and
- offer constructive suggestions to authors for how to improve the quality, clarity, and presentation of their manuscript.

The handling editor makes the final decision that takes into consideration the reviewers' comments. The decision of the editor(s) is communicated to the authors and the reviewers.

All manuscripts submitted to INTERPRAEVENT undergo an initial screening by an editor to assure concordance with the Congress's focus and audience. The manuscripts that pass the initial screening are sent out for peer review. Reviewers are invited as needed. All reviewers are asked to declare any competing interests.

- The review process for INTERPRAEVENT is single-blind. Reviewers generally remain anonymous (they have the option to include their name with the comments to the authors, if they wish). Reviews are seen only by the authors and the editor handling the given assignment.
- The final decision is made by the handling editor, with input from the editor-in-chief, based on the reviewers' recommendations.

Types of Manuscripts Submitted to INTERPRAEVENT

The Research Society INTERPRAEVENT works to reduce damages from natural disasters and supports interdisciplinary research to protect our living space against flooding, debris flows, avalanches and mass movements.

Focus will be on integrated management of natural hazards and risks, equally considering causes of disasters as well as measures of prevention, preparedness, response and recovery in the view of global changes.

Submitted papers can concern original research, basic or applied, or practical experience and case studies.

Authors either submit an extended abstract of 2 pages including at least one figure or table or a full paper of 6 to 8 pages including figures and tables.

Review period and workload

You might be asked to review:

- Extended abstracts of 2 pages in from February to October of 2019
- Full papers of 8 to 10 pages from February to October 2019

You might be asked to review both, extended abstracts and full papers. The editors are conscious that you can review up to 8 extended abstracts, but not more than 3 full papers.

Review process

Invitation to review

By email, you will receive an invitation to review a manuscript. The invitation will come from "Ip2020 Editor Bergen (editor.bergen2020@interpraevent.at)" with the subject as "Reviewer Invitation for Manuscript XXXXX" with the XXXXX being the assigned manuscript number. The email will contain your username and password, the title page and abstract of submission, and links to accept or decline the invitation to review. Occasionally, the links may malfunction and you may need to log on and accept or decline as outlined below.

If you are unable to complete the review timely, please decline the invitation so that we can invite another reviewer. If you do not respond to the email within 8 days, you will be "uninvited" automatically. If you accept to do the review but you do not finish it within the given time, you will be uninvited after 2 days automatically so that we expedite the review process. The review is due within 20 days.

Please keep your email address and other contact information current. If you need to update your profile, log in through your current username and password, revise your contact information via the "change details" link, and select "update" before closing the screen.

If requesting your username and password, please use the same email address every time. If you are confident that you are a registered user and are unable to retrieve your username and password, please do not register again because doing so will create multiple entries for your name and tracking your manuscripts and reviews will be problematic. Please choose "contact us" from the top menu and send an e-mail if you have questions or need assistance. You may also find detailed instructions in the reviewer's tutorial (see button on the log in page).

Log in and respond

At https://www.editorialmanager.com/ip2020/click on "Log in" and enter your user name and password as provided in your invitation email. Click "Reviewer Log In," which will bring you to your Reviewer Main Menu. If you don't click "Reviewer Log In," the default log in is as an author and you will not be able to access the information you need to respond or complete the review.

On the Main Menu for Reviewers, you will see three categories:

- New Reviewer Invitations: You have not yet viewed or responded to
- Pending Assignments: You have agreed to review but have not yet completed
- Completed Assignments: You have completed and your review has been received by the Editorial Office. You may view completed assignments indefinitely.

Click on "New Reviewer Invitations" on the left hand side and you will see a box that reads:

View Abstract/Title Page Agree to Review Decline to Review

Please review the abstract and title page for any conflict of interest and whether the subject is within your expertise. Click on "Agree" or "Decline."

Access the manuscript

If you agree to review, an automatic "thank you" email is sent, providing access to the full manuscript file. This email advises you of the due date (generally 20 days from your date of acceptance) and your user name and password. If you log out of the system and return through https://www.editorialmanager.com/ip2020/as a reviewer, you will see that the manuscript has moved from "New Reviewer Invitations" into your "Pending Assignments."

Submit your review

When you are ready to submit your review, log in as a reviewer at https://www.editorialmanager.com/ip2020/and find the manuscript in your Pending Assignments. Click on "Submit Recommendation" and the review form will open.

If, while entering your review, you wish to exit and come back later, the "Save and Submit Later" button will save whatever you have done in your Pending Assignments.

The Editorial Manager System has five categories (Recommendation, Manuscript Rating, Review questions, Comments for Authors, and Confidential Comments to the Editor). The system requires information for the first four categories. Confidential Comments to the Editor are greatly appreciated but are not mandatory. Details about the five categories are as follows:

1. Recommendation - At the top please provide your recommendation with the following choices available in a drop down menu: Accept, Minor Revision, Major Revision, or Reject. If a manuscript will require a complete re-write, or if the methodology is critically flawed, please reject.

2. Manuscript Rating - Across from the recommendation, please rate the overall quality of a manuscript, based on the following guidelines:

80-100 = Excellent. The recommendation is usually an "accept as is" or "accept with minor changes." Few manuscripts meet this standard on first submission. Characteristics: good science, follows scientific method, no major flaws, exciting new information ("breakthrough"), timely, clinically relevant, well-planned, data clearly presented, logical analysis, appropriate statistics, discussion and conclusions flow logically from data, good grammar and spelling, format appropriate for journal, follows instructions, excellent readability, no conflict of interest or ethical problems, title and length appropriate, citations comprehensive but not excessive, probable "lead" article, may justify an accompanying editorial.

60-79 = Above average. Most accepted papers are in this category. The recommendation is usually "accept with minor changes" or "moderate revision." Characteristics: re-review usually not necessary, no major flaws in concept or logic, no ethical or conflict of interest problems, adds some new information with clinical relevance, readable, clinically relevant, appropriate analysis, minor flaws correctable without major effort, language good, formatting appropriate or easily corrected, citations reasonable.

40-59 = Average. Many of these manuscripts could be revised and accepted, or may be rejected depending on space or priority. Characteristics: good science but not exciting, not new, issues already well described in literature, moderate or extensive revisions required, re-review may be necessary, average readability, grammar, and style, often too long, appropriate analysis, citations reasonable.

20-39 = Below average. Almost all manuscripts in this category are likely to be rejected, although some high priority topics survive one or more major revisions and are published if space is available. Characteristics: revision unlikely to lead to acceptance, major revisions recommended, re-review necessary, flawed study organization, data collection, methods, analysis inadequate or inappropriate, low clinical relevance, disconnect between data and conclusions, no new information, poor writing, incomplete or excessive citations.

1-19 = Unacceptable. Reject. Characteristics: hopeless, flawed beyond repair, inappropriate for journal, insufficient new information, poorly conceived, data inadequate, analysis flawed, language unacceptable, no justification for additional peer-review effort, citations inadequate.

3. Review Question - These questions should help you to do the rating of the submission and to make a recommendation. You are asked to answer the following questions by rating them from 1 to 3 (1 = no; 2 = quite good; 3 = yes):

Are the objectives clearly defined?

Is the methodology sound and are the assumptions clearly identified?

Are the data sufficient and of high enough quality to support the conclusions?

Are the outcomes discussed?

Does the Paper contain significant new original information?

Is the Paper well organized and clearly presented (tables, figures)?

Is the standard language usage satisfactory?

4. Comments for Authors - Please type in or "cut and paste" your comments that are to be conveyed (anonymously) to authors.

5. Confidential Comments to the Editor - These comments are seen only by the Editor and Editorial Office and are not shared with authors or other reviewers.

If you would like a paper record of your review, click on "Proof and Print." When you are ready to submit your review, click on "Proceed." This will give you a final look at your review and let you either edit further or submit the review to the Editorial Office.

After your review

You will receive an acknowledgment of receipt and note of thanks from the Editorial Office. All reviewers are listed as members of the editorial board on the congress web site and in the proceedings.

If you wish to see comments to the author(s) of the other reviewer(s) and the final decision, please log in as a reviewer and go to your completed reviews.