Peer Reviewer Orientation: *The Neurodiagnostic Journal*

Thank you for your interest in peer reviewing for *The Neurodiagnostic Journal*! To help orient you to this important role in the manuscript process, below are answers to some frequently asked questions.

What is the expected time commitment?

Since reviewers are invited to review a manuscript, reviewers always have the option to decline an invitation based on time constraints, competing priorities, or if the paper is beyond their acumen. Reviewers often go months without receiving an invitation because we have a large pool to ease reviewer burden. When submission volume increases and many reviewers are unavailable, you may see an uptick in invitations. You will be invited to review papers that match your credentials or experience.

When an invitation is sent, that starts the 30-day clock until the review deadline (*Note: Deadline extensions can be requested by emailing Monica Mikulec, Managing Editor, at monica@aset.org*). The number of hours you spend reviewing then depends on the length and complexity of the paper and the number of revisions it may need to go through to resolve any comments. We ask that reviewers dedicate the time necessary to conduct a quality review.

Will I receive CEUs?

Yes. CEUs offered vary by article type:

- Waveform Window= .5 CEU
- Technical Tips= 1 CEU
- Original Research= 2 CEUs
- Case Report= 1 CEU
- Review= 2 CEUs

Do I need previous peer review experience?

No. We are here to help you with any questions you may have. We do require reviewers to hold neurodiagnostic credentials or board certifications in their area of practice.

How long are manuscripts?

They range in length from two or three pages to 10 or more pages. It very much depends on the article type (original research, case report, etc.) and complexity of the topic.

What subject matter is considered in scope for the journal?

The journal is focused on the clinical application of various neurodiagnostic modalities. Our scope also includes non-clinical topics such as neurodiagnostic management, education, and legislation.

How exactly is the peer review conducted?

We create a profile for you in an online editorial management system operated and managed by our publisher, Taylor & Francis. Your username and password will be emailed to you. Reviewers receive system email notifications when they have been invited to a review. From that email you can click on a link that will take you to the manuscript for your initial perusal and response to the invitation. Should you accept, you must document your comments in the system (see example below) before the deadline (usually in 30 days).

Custom Review Question(s):	Response
As a thank you and to acknowledge the contribution of our reviewers, the journal may publish a list of the names of those who have reviewed at the end of the year. This will not be linked to any specific paper and will only be done if the list of reviewers is long enough to protect the anonymity of the review process for individual papers. If you would prefer for your name **not to be included** in a published list of reviewers, please indicate this below.	Do not include my name
If anyone else was involved in writing this review, for example a student or a colleague, and they agree to be recognized for this work please provide their name and email address in the free text box below.	
Do you want to get recognition for this review on Publons? *Don't let your reviewing work go unnoticed! Researchers the world over use Publons to effortlessly track their valuable peer review contributions for any journal. If you opt in, your Publons profile will automatically be updated to show a verified record of this review in full compliance with the journal's review policy. If you don't have a Publons profile, you will be prompted to create a free account. [Learn more]*	No
Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?	Yes
Is the problem or topic within the scope of the *The Neurodiagnostic Journal*?	yes it is a novel technique
Is the topic explored in the article significant enough to deserve publication?	if the methods and results are clarified
Is there something new in the article?	yes new technique
Are the methods and results described sufficiently?	no--more detail is needed
Are the results presented adequately; are they statistically correct?	More details are required
Are the authors' conclusions justified?	more details are needed
Is there an adequate review of the literature? Is recent literature included?	this is adequate but interpretation of the literature is not as noted below
Is this review article interesting, informative, and of current interest?	
Do you have any conflict of interest to declare?	No
I confirm I have not uploaded the author manuscript to any third party tool and have not used a generative AI tool to produce this reviewer report.	• I Confirm

Comments to Editor:

Please enter confidential comments to the editor.

Comments to Author:

The authors use a 132 channel neuromagnetometer to record magnetic activity in the wrist after stimulation of the fifth finger. In 6 healthy patients and a single patient with an "ulnar neuropathy at the wrist". As with all nove make the technique used evident to readers who may want to use similar techniques in the future.
I have some specific comments
1)The term "fifth finger" should be used rather than "little finger".
2)In the introduction line 10 it is stated that its difficult to localized lesions using nerve conduction studies. This technique has been successfully used for more than 50 years and the reference cited refers to ulnar motor condu should be eliminated.
3)Introduction line 12 the reference used indicates that it was possible with careful traditional nerve conduction studies to localize median neuropathy at the wrist so the statement of the authors is not accurate. Similarly refer be better if the entire first paragraph was reformulated.
4)On page 4 line 11 is seems that the authors are using stimulation at 3 times the sensory threshold which might be painful (can the authors provide the stimulation current level used?). However, if the stimulation is 10Hz for and would most likely be intensely painful. The authors need to comment on this. Page 5 has more information on this but it is hard to believe that 4ma is triple the sensory threshold. Can the authors clarify?
5)On page 4 line 20 the authors refer to recording magnetic stimulus artifact. I really don't understand the procedure and the reference doesn't clarify this. What is the function of the urethane plate? The authors should provi is critical to the signal processing algorithm and so needs to be very clear maybe even with examples of the recording results. Figure one shows some images but the caption is inadequate to understand the artifact removal is not generate a pure stimulus artifact that would be seen in the actual patients. Inflating a cuff temporarily on the proximal little finger would provide a direct measure. Figure 2 indicates that the stimulus artifact may be a hun possible to record reliable responses with this signal to noise ratio.

General Peer Review Guidelines

1. ## Conduct knowledge and conflict checks.

   If the manuscript is outside your scope of expertise, or you realize you know the identity of the author or have any conflict of interest, you can ask to have someone else assigned to the review.

2. ## Read first like a reader.

   Read the entire paper as if you were not an editor or a reviewer but a general reader opening the paper to learn something.

3. Take the time to understand the problem, methodology, and results. Then ask yourself: Are the conclusions warranted based on the data?
4. Ask questions.
   If you don't understand something, it's ok to do some research. If you still can't gain clarification, then it's likely other readers will have the same issue. Note your questions and concerns in your review comments.
5. Focus on quality of content, not grammar.
   While general comments about language are welcome, reviewers should not edit manuscripts. The accepted version will go through copyediting and proofreading prior to publication.

Peer Review Checklist: The Nitty Gritty Technicalities

1. The appropriate ethical/IRB/IACUC approvals (if needed) have been obtained.
2. References are relevant and current. *Note: It is not generally good policy for the reviewers to suggest that an author cite one of their own papers.*
3. **Figures**
   a) Are they original or taken from other publications? If they are taken from other publications, the author needs permission to reprint them.
   b) Are they easily interpreted? Are events clearly annotated on EEG scans? Are time, amp, and wave marks present and clear?
   c) Is there a scale for waveforms? Is the scale appropriate to allow visualization of the effect described?
4. Appropriate statistical methods were used to analyze the data.
5. Writing is concise, clear, and generated by a person.
6. For revisions: **The author addressed ALL of your comments.** If they did not, this is grounds to revert the submission back to the author.

Comprehensive information about peer review can be found on the Taylor & Francis Editor Resources website.

Peer Review Decisions

Reviewers make a recommendation of accept, conditional accept, minor revision, major revision, reject and resubmit, or reject. Learn how to choose the right recommendation by reading our reviewer decision definitions and examples here.

If you have any questions, please contact:

Monica Mikulec | Managing Editor, *The Neurodiagnostic Journal*
ASET Director of Communications and Publications
phone: 301.641.2538
email: monica@aset.org