

Journal of Materials Processing Technology – Guide to writing a good review

The JMPT “Guide for authors” describes the format and structure requirements for submitting a paper to the journal. The “Guide to writing a good paper” proposes a model for writing a good paper, and gives some advice on writing style. The model described in that guide describes the authors as the defence lawyers in a court case in which the reviewers are arguing the case “this work is no good.” That seems to us to be a useful model for authors, and helpful for reviewers to think about while reading – but is probably not a useful way for reviewers to write their reports!

Our top priority as editors-in-chief of the JMPT is to raise the quality of papers in the journal. To support these objectives, we will attempt to send to reviewers only papers which we think have a high chance of eventual publication: we have explained to authors the criteria for sending papers to review in our ‘editorial policy’. Accordingly, we hope that most of your effort as a reviewer will be to act as ‘coach’ to the authors – to help them to improve the description or content of their work. We would like to ask you to write your review in the spirit of offering sound advice to the authors based on evidence not opinion or emotion. Therefore we would ask you to avoid phrases such as “the review section is terrible” and prefer evidence based statements “the review section fails to acknowledge the three key papers in this area, which are by ...”

Following the six basic elements of a good paper that we have proposed in our “guide to writing a good paper” we would like you to consider the following issues in reviewing the paper:

Context . Does the introduction establish a clear need for research work?

Analysis of existing work. Does the paper give a satisfactory summary of existing work in the area and demonstrate that a knowledge gap exists relative to the claimed need for the work?

Proposal. Does the paper make a clear proposal of new transferable knowledge?

Design of test and implementation. Does the paper describe an appropriate objective test of the value of the proposed new knowledge?

Results and evaluation. Are the results presented clearly and objectively and are they supported by a careful evaluation.

Discussion and conclusions. Do the authors correctly appreciate the value of their work and its implications for others?

Abstract. Is the abstract a clear summary of the paper?

Typically a reviewer’s report will be between a half and one page of single spaced text. We retain the right to make final decisions about paper acceptance, but would value your opinions as to whether the paper should be accepted immediately, revised slightly, given a major rewrite or rejected.

Thank you for your work in reviewing for the JMPT. If you have any comments on our editorial policy or guides to good practice that you think may help us to improve the quality of JMPT papers further, we would be very grateful to hear from you.