

Young Scientist Reviewers' Guide

2016

Guidelines for Review of Manuscripts submitted to *Young Scientist*

Please see www.youngscientistjournal.org for last year's volume as a reference – however, we hope that each year is even better than the last! The next volume will host twenty research articles. The articles will be no more than three pages in length using the [JACS \(Journal of the American Chemical Society\) article template](#) (in final format) including a maximum of three figures while supplementary material will be made available at an online website. We therefore expect the burden for reviewers to be limited. As the manuscript must be understandable to the educated public, it is desirable for the reviewer to be outside of the primary field of research discussed in the manuscript.

The schedule for review will be as follows:

- Submissions due and delivered to reviewers: November 30th, 2015
- Initial review deadline: December 15th, 2015 (1-2 papers for review/3-4 hr time commitment)
- Resubmission due and 'major revisions' delivered to reviewers: January 15th, 2016
- Final review due: January 31st, 2016

Journal Audience and Article Structure

The journal targets the educated public and will be distributed on campus, other colleges, online, and at local high-schools. Therefore manuscripts must be written in a language that is clear for multiple levels of educational background. The Abstract and Introduction should state the background, significance, and objective understandable to the general public. Materials and methods section should be kept at a minimum but still at a higher level of science. Results, Discussion and Conclusions should be presented at a high level of science as well with clear and concise figures and tables (in high print resolution). Discussion should highlight most important aspects that are of general interest. Conclusions should be brief and direct and can be included in the Discussion section

Comments from Reviewers (in part taken from JACS)

The goal is to make a recommendation to

1. Accept manuscript as is,
2. Accept manuscript with minor revisions (revised version may or may not be sent back to you for review),
3. Accept manuscript with major revisions (revised version will be sent back to you for review),
4. Not recommended for print.

While being critical, keep in mind that this is the first manuscript of a high-school student. We hope to accept most manuscripts. Given the limited experience of the writers, we expect revisions are needed in most cases. In short, don't be shy to critique, but be specific and constructive. Reject manuscripts that even major revisions cannot fix! The final manuscript needs to be at high quality. Please estimate the following (feel free to use a scale of 1 (low) through 5 (high)) and provide comments:

1. The scientific value of the work
2. Writing style: clear, concise, and relevant?
3. Readership: Is it of interest to the broad readership of the *Young Scientist*?

Young Scientist Reviewers' Guide 2016

Other questions/issues that may be addressed:

1. Indicate specifically whether descriptions of methods, tables of data, etc., should be reduced or eliminated with the understanding that they would be available to specialists in the form of Supporting Information or in some other way.
2. Are the conclusions adequately supported by the data presented?
3. Are the literature references appropriate (no Wikipedia!)?
4. Does the nomenclature used conform to accepted practice?

Please be as specific as possible if revision by the Author is recommended. The manuscripts will not be submitted in the final format. **Formatting will be left to the editorial review.** However, it would be helpful for reviewers to cite issues such as figures that take lots of space, tables that have little information or are unnecessary, figures with unnecessary color, etc... (in general, issues that interfere with the quality of the presentation). The editors will also reformat manuscripts to comply with the template. You may either provide **your own document with a list of revisions/comments** OR you can provide **your comments using track changes in Microsoft Word document (recommended)** named accordingly.

If you have questions, please don't hesitate to contact any member of the editorial board (young.scientist@vanderbilt.edu). Thank you for your support!

Young Scientist Editorial Board

Charles Brau charles.a.brau@vanderbilt.edu

Chris Vanags chris.vanags@vanderbilt.edu

Jens Meiler jens.meiler@vanderbilt.edu