

Information for Referees of *Science Signaling* Reviews

Criteria for Judgment

Reviews should provide new insights as well as summarize the information currently available. The best reviews reflect the unique viewpoint of the author and show how new findings alter current thinking about major issues in a particular field. Usually, the review should not be exclusively focused on the author's own results. Please evaluate the article for scholarship, accuracy, clarity, and effectiveness of presentation, and indicate why the paper should or should not be published in *Science Signaling*. The main criteria for selection are:

Comprehensibility. The text should be well written, well organized, and intelligible to the general reader. Readers should be able to learn from the article what has been firmly established and what are significant unresolved questions; speculation should be kept to a minimum.

Technical Merit. The data and analytical methods should justify the conclusions.

Bias. The article should correctly cite important discoveries in the field and, although it may focus primarily on work done in one laboratory or by one group of investigators, it should be set in the context of, and acknowledge, work done by other investigators whether or not they have conflicting views.

Length. *Science Signaling* does not impose strict page limits; however, the article should be well-focused and as concise as possible. Reviews may have one or more figures or tables.

Conflict of Interest

If you cannot judge this paper impartially, please let us know immediately. If you have any financial or professional affiliations that may be perceived as a conflict of interest in reviewing the manuscript, please describe those affiliations on a separate page and return it with your review. Your comments will be considered in the context of this review and will be kept confidential.

Confidentiality

We expect reviewers to protect the confidentiality of the material presented. Please ensure that the enclosed manuscript is not disseminated or exploited. If you find it necessary to discuss this paper with a colleague, please specify the particulars in a letter to the editor. Our review process is confidential; we do not disclose the identity of our reviewers or any confidential material they have provided to us.

Returning Your Review

We prefer to receive referee's comments through our electronic referee site. Each referee is sent by e-mail a unique log in and password that allows the referee to access the manuscript and submit comments. If you cannot locate this information, please write sciencesignalingeditors@aaas.org. We recommend that you type your review in a separate file with word processing software and paste the text into the review form online. If you have attachments, such as figures, or complex formatting, such as equations, that cannot be conveyed in text form, you may send these by email to scisignalreview@aaas.org by FAX to 202-408-9697. Please also include the manuscript ID number in the Subject line of your E-mail or on top of the faxed pages. The ID number is found in the filename of the PDF of the manuscript that you are reviewing.

Headquarters