JHEP

Published for SISSA by Springer

Guidelines for Referees

1 The peer-review process

Referees play a very important role in the publication process and their work is crucial for the success of the journal.

When accepting an article to review please ensure that the content of the manuscript is close enough to your area of expertise so that you can provide a prompt and professional review. If this is not the case or you cannot provide a timely review, please decline as soon as possible and if known suggest names for alternate reviewers. The *Journal of High Energy Physics* (JHEP) maintains the highest standards of publication and research ethics. Referees are expected to comply with COPE Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers.

Reviewers should declare potentially competing financial, personal relationships, or academic interests that could affect impartiality. For example:

- Working for the same institution as any of the authors; recent collaboration with them (in the past 3 years); being joint grant holders;
- Very similar manuscript to one you have in preparation or under consideration;
- Affiliation with same institution; being a member of the same group or collaboration;
- In a position to exploit the authors' work (commercially or otherwise);
- In other ways prevented from objectively reviewing the manuscript.

By accepting a review invitation, reviewers commit to the journal's ethical guidelines, which besides disclosing any conflicts of interest, include maintaining confidentiality of the manuscript, and preserving their anonymity as reviewers.

JHEP does not approve the unrestricted use of large language models, AI chatbots like ChatGPT, and AI generative models for writing peer review reports. The two main reasons for this are:

- Uploading any portion of a manuscript into an external generative AI model could violate the authors' confidentiality rights, and infringe on data protection rights.
- Generative AI models are not subject matter experts and cannot take responsibility for the evaluation of scientific work, nor comply with the journal's ethical standards.

Still, for the purpose of refining, summarising or slightly correcting the text of their report, referees may use AI tools that ensure confidentiality, do not store or share the content, and do not use the material for training AI models, taking in any case full responsibility for its final content.

In assessing the manuscript please keep in mind the journal scope, and that the criteria for acceptance of a preprint by JHEP are high scientific quality, originality and relevance. Routine or "not wrong" work is not sufficient for acceptance.

Below are some guidelines to help you when performing the review of the manuscript and writing your report. These guidelines are aligned to the journal standards and expectations for a professional and constructive report.

In general: be clear and concrete when pointing out flaws, criticisms should be scientifically substantiated. Provide clear evidence and carefully explain your reasoning for your criticism.

Use clear simple wording that is respectful. Avoid unnecessary overly negative comments or polemics. Offensive and/or derogative language will not be tolerated.

Be critical but constructive. If there is a chance that the above criteria for acceptance can be met, focus on improvement.

Start by summarising the main results of the manuscript, what are the key results and the value they add to the field:

- Evaluate the significance of the results
- Evaluate the originality of the results
- What does the manuscript add to the subject area compared with other published material?
- Report manuscript strengths. Then state flaws or weaknesses
- Has similar work been published already without authors acknowledging it?

Evaluate technical quality of the manuscript:

- Are the methods used appropriate?
- Is the work technically correct?
- Are models, methods, approximation etc. sufficiently well described and motivated?
- Are the conclusions consistent with the evidence and arguments presented? Do they address the main question posed?

Evaluate the presentation:

- Is the manuscript well written? Is the text clear and easy to read, written in standard, comprehensible English? It the presentation well organised?
- Is the description of the technical part clear and comprehensive?
- Is the article complete in all its parts (references, supplementary material etc.)

Conclude with your recommendation:

- Can be published as it stands
- Should be sent back to authors for minor revisions
- Should be sent back to authors for major revisions
- Cannot be published.

Revised versions. If you are asked to review a revised manuscript, a list of changes to the article may be included (this will have been provided by the author). You should judge the revised manuscript according to the same quality criteria as you did the original version. If the authors have not addressed your concerns satisfactorily make this clear in your report.

2 Guidelines for payments

In the spirit that scientists' work must be compensated, a token fee has been instituted and will be paid on a yearly basis to JHEP referees: 30EUR per paper. Referees may choose to donate the fees to initiatives for the benefit of the scientific community (see, for example, https://jhep.sissa.it/jhep/common/editor_referee_donations.jsp). Payment is made the following year (i.e. for final decisions made by editors in 2022, referees will be paid their fee in 2023) if at least 5 papers have been reviewed. Otherwise, it will be postponed till this threshold has been reached, in order to make money transfer costs worth their while, for a maximum of 3 years. The fourth year, even if the threshold has not been reached, the fee will be paid in any case to avoid excessive delay. Once the required number of papers have been reviewed, or after 3 years, referees will be sent an email with full instructions to receive their payment. To qualify for payment referees are expected both to bear in mind the high quality standards set by the journal and to use in full the potential of the web system, taking all the steps required by the automatic editorial procedure for review work. In particular:

(a) Please always use the web pages ("accept assignment") to inform the editor as soon as possible about when you will be able to send your review;

(b) Please always use the web pages ("send report") in order to upload your review (no emails).

Furthermore:

(c) Make sure you meet the deadline (or inform the editor if a postponement cannot be avoided);

(d) All versions of a given preprint should be reviewed, if so requested by the editor in charge.

If any one of the conditions above is not met, we regret that no compensation can be paid. This lack of flexibility is unavoidable, as nearly 6000 papers are processed in our journals every year and it is therefore strictly necessary to rely extensively on the system, both to run the process and, specifically, to automatically compute referee dues. Should compensations be prevented from being paid to editors or reviewers with bank accounts or residence in countries subject to sanctions by Italian or European government regulations, the amounts owed will be set aside until they can be released when said sanctions are lifted. We trust that you will understand our constraints and continue cooperating with us and therefore with the community.