

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Below, we show the format of the reviewer report and provide some information and questions for you to bear in mind. If you have any comments about these guidelines, please contact the Managing Editor via ian.newman@oup.com.

Current overall ratings for the paper

High priority

Medium Priority

Low priority

Recommendations

Accept – No More Revisions Required

Revise – Only Rewriting and/or Language-Polishing Required

Revise – Additional Experiments Required

Reject – Poor Experimental Design

Reject – Lack of Originality

Reject – Major Additional Experiments and/or Rewriting Required

Reject - Generally Poor Quality

Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editor

(Note that the Associate Editor who is handling the paper can view the “*Comments to the Author*” so there is no need to duplicate comments here.)

- Can the paper be accepted at this stage?

- Should it be rejected?

If a paper is rejected, constructive comments will be helpful if the authors consider submitting it elsewhere.

- What is the likelihood of acceptance if the authors address your comments?

- **Is there evidence of any potential scientific misconduct?**
- **Do you as a referee have any conflicts of interest?**
- **Did any of your colleagues help with the review?**

Comments to the Author

International Immunology uses a 'single-blind' peer-review system whereby the reviewer is kept anonymous; nevertheless, we ask referees to be constructive and to avoid any wording that the author may find offensive. Because English is not the native language for many of our authors, please try to use straightforward phrasing and vocabulary.

In the free-text section of your report, please briefly summarise the paper's goals, key findings, strengths and weaknesses.

It is usually best to provide a numbered list of recommendations for revision. Please state clearly whether requested revisions are essential or optional. Note that we routinely allow 6 months for revision.

The checklist below includes the criteria we feel are important for papers submitted to our journal:

- **Are the findings sound, novel and interesting?**
- **Is the paper suitable, or can it be made suitable, for the broad readership of *International Immunology*? If not, would you recommend that it submitted to a more specialised journal?**

This journal publishes experimental and theoretical studies from all areas of immunology. Original-research articles must describe significant and original observations, especially those that provide mechanistic biological insights. Papers describing only specialized methods are not acceptable unless they contain meaningful results obtained with the methods. The mere description of, for example, a new monoclonal antibody, a protein or DNA sequence, a structure or an epitope is generally unacceptable unless it provides significant insight about the immune system.

- **Are the experiments valid?**
- **What additional experiments are essential to make the paper suitable for publication in this journal?**
- **Is there a statement that the appropriate ethical approval has been obtained?**
- **Should supplementary data or methods be provided by the authors?**
- **Does the title accurately describe the contents?**

- Does the Abstract accurately summarise the findings?
- Does the Introduction give adequate background to understand the results and does it clearly state the objectives of the study?
- Are the methods appropriate and are they described in sufficient detail so that the methodology can be replicated?
- Is the statistical analysis complete and appropriate?
- Are the results logically presented and adequately described?
- Are error bars on figures defined?
- Are the numbers within experimental groups and the number of replications clearly stated?
- Are the conclusions warranted on the basis of the experiments described?
- Are the limitations of the conclusions described, alternative hypotheses discussed and the implications for future studies included?
- Has the appropriate literature been cited and discussed adequately?
- Can the language, structure or presentation be improved so that the paper can be better understood?

Revised papers

Please do not raise issues that could have been noted in the original review but were not.

New issues arising from data added during revision can be raised.

Please check whether any appropriate new literature been cited and discussed adequately.