

Health Technology

Instruction for Reviewers

About the Journal

Advancements in health technology have allowed physicians to better diagnose and treat their patients since the beginning of the professional practice of medicine. The *Journal of Healthy Technology* focuses on the most recent advances within a wide scope of disciplines, encompassing biomedical engineering, and computer and information science for healthcare. It plays as a professional and comprehensive platform for readership of biomedical and electrical engineers, physical and computer scientists, and mathematicians around the world to share the latest ideas and advances through rapid online publication of original healthcare technology research.

The journal welcomes a wide range of submission types, including high-quality research, clinical trials reports, technique reports, review articles, video clips, editorial letter, etc. Articles will be solicited from recognized experts in these fields, while submissions for peer review will also be considered. The high quality of its content is assured by a rigorous review process, supervised by a strong editorial board.

We hope it can establish a platform to broaden knowledge in this interdisciplinary field not only for experts but for patients.

Exemplary general topics within the journal's scope are:

1. Medical and Biological Engineering:

- Nano biomaterials
- Wearable Electronics Sensors
- Biochips
- Design of science and technology
- Optical instruments
- Microscopy, Tissue engineering, bio-inspired materials
- Intelligent products
- Rehabilitation technology
- Bio-robotics, surgical planning and biomechanics
- Therapeutic and diagnostic systems, devices and technologies
- Clinical engineering

2. Medical Information Technology:

- Big Data in Biology and Medicine

- The innovations of precision medicine/Precision Medicine Initiative
- Biomedical signal processing
- Biomedical imaging and image processing
- Information about the internet of things
- Applications of Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM)
- Medical and hospital informatics
- Telemedicine, e-health and home care methods
- Public health

Open peer review

HT uses fully blind peer review, meaning that:

- reviewers are required to sign reviews with their name, position and institution
- any competing interests should be declared

Reviewers should contact the editorial office confidentially should the need arise in the case of, for example, a concern over a matter of publication ethics.

The role of reviewers

If we need your help with appraising a manuscript we will email you and ask you to accept or decline the invitation through our submission site.

We ask reviewers to help us to ensure that any studies published in *HT* were conducted properly, are scientifically credible, reported according to the appropriate guidelines (e.g. CONSORT for clinical trials) and ethical. The editorial team is responsible for the final decision to accept or reject a manuscript, based on the reviewers' comments.

We welcome feedback from our reviewers. If you have any comment you want to make, either on a manuscript you have reviewed, on our decision on it or on our review process in general, we would be pleased to hear from you.

To become a *HT* reviewer

If you would like to volunteer, please register at: <http://ht.amegroups.com/login>. This process will automatically add your name, contact details and expertise to our database of reviewers. Please let us know once you have registered.

Guidance for peer reviewers

All unpublished manuscripts are confidential documents. If we invite you to review an article and you choose to discuss the manuscript with a colleague, please remind them of the confidential nature of the paper and acknowledge their input in your review. Please also encourage colleagues to register as reviewers.

HT uses a blind form of peer review, meaning that authors will not know who has reviewed their work.

If you have any serious concerns about a manuscript from a publication ethics perspective - for example if you believe you have encountered a case of plagiarism - you can contact the editorial office in confidence.

Writing your review

When you provide your review via our online editorial office please declare any competing interest that might relate to the article. These should be personal, professional or financial competing interests relevant to the paper being reviewed. A review form will be sent to you when you accept the invitation to review a specific article.

Before writing your review you may find it helpful to browse our instructions for authors, available here (<http://ht.amegroups.com/public/addition/ht/ht-instruction-for-authors.pdf>). We ask authors to provide article summaries and to upload appropriate reporting statements - these

should aid in the reviewing process.

All submitted manuscripts are reviewed initially by the *HT* editors. Manuscripts are evaluated according to the following criteria: material is original and timely, writing is clear, study methods are appropriate, data are valid, conclusions are reasonable and supported by the data, information is important, and topic has general medical interest. From these basic criteria, the editors assess a paper's eligibility for publication. Other manuscripts are sent to expert consultants for peer review. Peer reviewer identities are kept confidential, but author identities are made known to reviewers. The existence of a manuscript under review is not revealed to anyone other than peer reviewers and editorial staff. Peer reviewers are required to maintain confidentiality about the manuscripts they review and must not divulge any information about a specific manuscript or its content to any third party without prior permission from the journal editors. Information from submitted manuscripts may be systematically collected and analyzed as part of research to improve the quality of the editorial or peer review process. Identifying information remains confidential. Final decisions regarding manuscript publication are made within the Editorial Team.

HT is very grateful to everyone who reviewed for the journal.