

Updated Guidance for *PRS Global Open* Reviewers- August 2022

Overview of recommendations

- **“Reject”** – Rejection should be recommended if you believe a manuscript is unsuitable for *PRS Global Open* and cannot be made suitable with revisions.
- **“Major Revision”** – Major revision should be recommended if you believe a manuscript requires extensive corrections and revisions (thoroughly made and carefully re- reviewed) to be made suitable for *PRS Global Open*.
- **“Minor Revision”** – Minor revision should be recommended if you have revision requests that will enhance or clarify a manuscript without requiring the authors to extensively rewrite the paper or rework the study (i.e., no fundamental flaws).
- **“Accept”** – Acceptance should be recommended if all previous requests have been thoroughly and adequately addressed and if no further revisions are needed. Acceptance should not be recommended in the first round of review, unless it is a truly exceptionally high-quality article.

Guidance for reviewer comments

The goal of PRS Global Open is to publish high quality articles that impact and improve the understanding of plastic surgery and delivery of safe and ethical care to patients. We are interested in hearing from authors from all over the world, and to that end, will publish papers that discuss alternative perspectives and techniques that may originate from various regions and countries. Studies that corroborate existing data, implying reproducibility, are acceptable and should not be rejected based on lack of novelty, as long as the author(s) explain how their paper adds to the existing literature in a meaningful way. Case reports are also accepted, which can highlight important clinically-oriented information.

Please remember we are an open access journal, so the audience for the paper, once accepted through peer review, is literally the entire world, as they will be able to access and read this content for free. Please have that in mind when you are performing your reviews and critiques.

Reviewer comments should offer thoughtful, constructive feedback to authors as well as aid the Editor-in-Chief in making a final decision for each manuscript. PRS Global Open reviewers are expected to follow the **“Peer Reviewer Golden Rule”**: **“Review unto others as you would have them review unto you.”** Peer reviewing for PRS Global Open is an opportunity to provide guidance and mentorship to authors, whether their manuscript is eventually published in PRS Global Open or in another journal entirely.

The reviewer form prompts reviewers to provide comments in two separate fields: Comments to the Authors and Confidential Comments to the Editor.

There are different purposes and expectations for each of these comment fields, as outlined below:

Comments to the Authors:

- Comments to the authors are **required**. While there are no upper or lower word limits on comments, please take the necessary time to make them substantive, constructive, and meaningful.

- If requesting revisions, concrete guidance to the authors is necessary to help them improve their paper.
- If recommending rejection, feedback is necessary to explain your concerns and support the Editor's final decision for the paper.
- Specificity is key.
 - Examples:
 - If you think there are too many figures, let the authors know *which* figures should be removed in your view (rather than simply stating that some figures should be removed).
 - If you believe the conclusions of a study are unjustified, provide concrete critiques for why they are unjustified and/or how they should be amended (rather than simply stating that the conclusions are unjustified).
- Comments to the authors should remain neutral.
 - Please provide impactful, constructive comments and critiques that will help the authors improve their paper. Inflammatory, derogatory, or insulting comments are not allowed.
 - Likewise, please refrain from offering overt praise, enthusiasm, or congratulations to the authors directly. Such comments to the author will be removed. If you are enthusiastic about a paper and believe it should be published, please let the Editor know in your confidential comments.
- Comments should critique the merits of the study itself.
 - Minor formatting, typos or copyediting issues need not be the addressed in your review, as the publisher and society both have personnel dedicated to copyediting and proofreading the text.
 - Two **exceptions**:
 - If the entire manuscript needs to be revised by a native English speaker, please alert the Editor in your reviewer comments.
 - If a figure (particularly a graphic or graph) has misspelled words or non- American spelling standards, please alert the authors.

Confidential Comments to the Editor:

- Comments to the Editor are **required** and should support and justify the recommendation you've made for a manuscript.
 - These comments can be candid and informal.
 - Provide 1-3 quick reasons to justify your selected recommendation (i.e., why you think a paper should be rejected, accepted, or revised/re-reviewed for *PRS Global Open*).
 - This should not be left blank
- Utilize confidential comments to let the Editor know if:
 - You have major concerns regarding the ethics or integrity of a manuscript.
 - Be on the lookout for salami slicing or duplication of publication when similar studies have been published in the past by the same authors or is pending publication
 - You feel a manuscript would be a better fit for a different journal.
 - You feel a manuscript may be better suited for *PRS Global Open* under a different article type.

New things we'd like reviewers to look for

Please alert the Editor and/or ask the authors to revise these items in your review:

- Titles that are unprofessional or hyperbolic.
- Professionalism of photographs
 - In addition to existing requests to judge the appropriateness, value, and quality of a figure, we ask that you also provide feedback on the professionalism of figures, in particular photographs:
 - The background should not be cluttered or have inappropriate imagery.
 - The operative field or substrate should not be "messy."

- The authors may or may not be able to provide updated figures; can the article be acceptable *without* this figure?