

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Enacted in September 2025

### 1. Introduction

This review guideline has been established to ensure that all manuscripts submitted to *Convergence Hepatology* are assessed rigorously, fairly, and transparently. Additionally, it emphasizes the journal's publication goals, which focus on the integration of imaging findings and clinical treatment of liver cancer or liver diseases, evaluation based on clinical progression, and convergence research involving various clinical medicine, basic science, and artificial intelligence.

### 2. Review Criteria

Manuscripts should be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- **Originality or Educational Perspective:** The content should present original new material, provide new insights into the treatment and research of liver cancer or liver diseases, or offer educational value to clinicians, basic and engineering researchers. For example, it should propose the potential of new biomarkers or models using artificial intelligence or suggest methods to improve survival rates after cancer treatment, providing valuable lessons to clinicians.
- **Relevance:** The topic should align with the journal's scope and be beneficial to researchers and clinicians in the field of liver cancer or liver diseases. For instance, studies on new biomarkers or liver cancer treatments have high relevance.
- **Scientific Rigor:** The research design, methodology, and analysis should be appropriate and robust for the research question. For example, prospective data collection studies using appropriate statistical tests best meet this criterion.
- **Clarity:** Manuscripts should be systematically organized and written in clear and concise language. For example, results should be presented in a logical sequence and supported by well-organized figures or tables.
- **Ethical Standards:** The manuscript must adhere to ethical guidelines, including obtaining appropriate patient consent and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. For instance, in case studies, patient consent must be clearly confirmed, and if consent cannot be obtained, the author should submit a separate document explaining this to the ethics editor.

### 3. Responsibilities of Reviewers

Reviewers should provide constructive, fair, and prompt feedback as follows:

- Evaluate the manuscript according to the journal's review criteria.
- Identify strengths and areas for improvement in the manuscript.
- Verify the manuscript's compliance with ethical standards.
- Declare any conflicts of interest and avoid reviewing if impartiality is compromised.
- Immediately report any ethical issues such as plagiarism, data fabrication, or lack of proper approval to the editorial office.
- Maintain confidentiality of the review process.

### 4. Peer Review Process

The peer review process is summarized in the following steps and follows the flowchart:

- **Initial Review:** The editorial team reviews the manuscript for basic submission requirements.
- **Reviewer Assignment:** At least two experts in the relevant field are selected as reviewers.
- **Double-Blind Review:** Authors and reviewers are unaware of each other's identities.
- **Reviewer Feedback:** Reviewers recommend one of the following: "Accept," "Accept with Minor Revisions," "Revise and Resubmit," or "Reject," along with detailed comments.
- **Editorial Decision:** The editor makes the final decision based on the reviews and communicates the result to the author.

### 5. Reviewer Recommendations

Reviewers should provide clear recommendations with specific reasons:

- **Accept:** The manuscript is ready for publication with minimal revisions.
- **Accept with Minor Revisions:** Minor changes for clarity or grammar are needed.
- **Revise and Resubmit:** Revisions to research methodology, data analysis, or interpretation are required.

- **Reject:** The manuscript does not meet the journal's publication standards.

For borderline cases, reviewers should explain concerns in detail and suggest additional data requests, reanalysis, or further explanation of major issues to ensure the editorial team can make an informed decision.

## 6. Ethical Considerations

Reviewers should report any of the following ethical issues immediately:

- Plagiarism or duplicate publication
- Data fabrication or falsification
- Missing ethical approval or patient consent

When handling ethical issues, confidentiality must be strictly maintained to protect the rights of individuals involved in the review process.

## 7. Review Deadlines

Reviewers should complete their reviews within 2-3 weeks of receiving

the manuscript. Extensions can be requested if needed.

## 8. Reviewer Recognition

The journal acknowledges the contributions of reviewers and provides the following rewards:

- Recognition in the annual list of reviewers
- Provision of peer review certificates upon request
- Incentives to encourage active participation

## 9. Appeal Process

Authors may appeal editorial decisions by submitting a letter of appeal with specific reasons. Appeals are reviewed by an independent editor or reviewer to ensure fairness. The decision of the independent review is final and promptly communicated to the author.

## 10. Guideline Updates

These guidelines are reviewed annually and updated as necessary to reflect trends in scholarly publishing. Changes are announced through the journal's website.