Table 1: Literature on guidelines to review scientific papers

	Title	Description
Books	[Weller 2002] "Editorial Peer Review: Its Strengths and Weaknesses"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description
	[Hames 2007] "Peer Preview and Manuscript Management in Scientific Journals"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description This is a sentence of description.
Journal Articles	[Parberry 1989] "A Guide for New Referees in Theoretical Computer Science"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description
	[Smith 1990] "The Task of the Referee"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description This is a sentence of description.
	[Drummond and Jefferson 1996] "A Quick Guide to Writing a Solid Peer Review"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description This is a sentence of description.
	[Hoppin 2002] "How I Review an Original Scientific Article"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description This is a sentence of description.
	[Benos et al. 2003] "How to review a paper"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description This is a sentence of description.
	[Hirst and Altman 2012] "Are Perr Reviewers Encouraged to Use Reporting Guidelines?"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description This is a sentence of description.
Reports	[Bernstein 2008] "Reviewing Conference Papers"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description
	[King 2011] "The Editors Speak: What Makes a Good Review"	This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description. This is a sentence of description This is a sentence of description.