

Reviewer Checklist (Proceedings track)

Biotechnology & Food Technologies Congress + Brewers' School (Saint Petersburg, 17–18 March 2026)

Use this checklist to structure your review. Provide comments for the author (constructive, actionable) and, if needed, confidential notes for the editors.

Recommendation

Decision	Use when...
Accept	The paper is publishable as is; only trivial editorial changes.
Minor revision	Solid work; a limited set of clarifications/corrections is required.
Major revision	The core idea is promising, but substantial improvements are required.
Reject	Out of scope, insufficient novelty/quality, flawed methods, or ethical issues.

Scope & contribution

- Is the topic within the scope of biotechnology / food science / fermentation / brewing technologies / applied microbiology / bioengineering?
- Is the contribution original and clearly stated (what is new vs existing work)?
- Is there a clear applied value, relevance for industry or scientific community?

Methods & results

- Are the methods appropriate and described in sufficient detail for understanding and replication?
- Are results presented clearly (tables/figures readable, units consistent)?
- Are claims supported by the data (no overinterpretation)?

Structure & clarity

- Is the manuscript logically structured (IMRAD recommended where applicable)?
- Is the abstract informative (objective, methods, key results, conclusion)?
- Is the language clear and professional (English proofreading may be needed)?

References

- Are key related works cited appropriately?
- Are references complete and consistently formatted?

Integrity & ethics

- Any signs of plagiarism or redundant publication? (If suspected, inform editors.)
- Any concerns about data integrity or manipulated figures?
- Conflicts of interest disclosed where relevant?

Actionable feedback

- List the top 3–5 issues the authors must address.
- List optional improvements (nice-to-have).
- Suggest specific edits: missing controls, unclear definitions, figure improvements, reference additions, etc.

Confidential notes to editors (optional): identify any ethical or integrity concerns, conflicts of interest, or reasons for a stronger recommendation.