

## **REVIEWER'S GUIDELINES**

### **GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS**

- Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method. All scholars who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.
- A selected reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and exclude himself from the review process.
- A manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.
- Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
- Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.
- Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF REVIEWER

1. **Accept:** -
  - a. **Without Modification** -Please explain the manuscript's contribution to the literature.
  - b. **Minor Modification:** - if the paper only needs minor corrections, e.g., spelling errors, correction of units, and other minor revisions to meet the requirements in the Guide for Authors.
  - c. **Major Modification:** - if the paper requires significant reconstruction, correction, expansion, additional references, etc.
2. **Reject:** - If the paper contains insufficient new or novel material, lacks good science, requires additional research work, shows incomprehensible writing, etc.

### Some suggestions/instructions for Reviewer

1. All guidelines to be written in tabular or as a running matter (Annexure-1).
2. Reviewer asked to confirm receipt of paper. (indicate mode)
3. Reviewer to be advised to avoid delay(for quick response) ( indicate time frame )
4. Mode of sending reviewed paper. (Mention website)
5. Maintain secrecy.
6. Remarks to be written in eligible form if hand written
7. For any clarification/query contacts should be provided. Editor e mail, phone number etc.
8. Remuneration to be mentioned if any.

**Annexure-1**

Scientific information and quality of presentation shall be the basis of manuscript evaluation and while evaluating, following checklist and criteria should be followed in letter and spirit.

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Checklist</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
1.	General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest clearly your comments and modifications about layout and format, title, abstract, introduction, graphical abstracts and/or highlights, methods, statistical errors, results, discussion and conclusion, spelling and grammatical errors, tables, figures and references.</li> <li>• Ethical issues like plagiarism, fraud or other ethical concerns should be referred to Editor-in-chief.</li> </ul>
2.	Title and authors	<p>Reviewer is duty bound to check whether</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The title accurately justifies and clearly represents the subject matter and is illustrative. .</li> <li>• The title is precise, attractive and easily understandable to other specialists.</li> <li>• The number and names of authors are placed in desired format.</li> </ul>
3.	Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract must be brief, summarizing significant findings and highlighting major objective of the research.</li> <li>• The results recorded in the abstract should be sufficiently specific.</li> <li>• The conclusion in the abstract should be consistent with the contents in the text.</li> </ul>
4.	Keywords	The keywords should be compatible with abstract
5.	Introduction/ background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It must address the research problem under study.</li> <li>• The conceptual framework should be amply clear and justified.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should emphasize relevant research context and elucidate other author's findings.</li> <li>• The research theme (research hypothesis where applicable) should be sufficiently clear and to the point.</li> </ul>
6.	Material and Methods (Methodology)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should clearly mention the study area, study population and sampling methods and other related areas.</li> <li>• It should explicitly indicate standard data collection and analysis methods.</li> <li>• The design should be optimally problem oriented, clearly described with full details and sufficient to replicate the research.</li> </ul>
7.	Data Analysis and Statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis procedures should be suitably described with complete details.</li> <li>• Data analysis procedures should be in conformity to the research design; hypotheses, models, or theory drives.</li> <li>• The number of models of analysis should be appropriately desirable.</li> <li>• Statistical tests should be appropriate and specific (optimal).</li> <li>• In qualitative research integrity in terms of data reliability, validity, trustworthiness with no room for bias should be upheld.</li> </ul>
8.	Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results should be prepared to be clear enough and easy to understand.</li> <li>• The results should be complete in all respects justifying the study under taken.</li> <li>• The amount of data presented should be appropriate, contextual and sufficient.</li> <li>• Figures, tables and graphs should include numbers, captions and labels and should be in line with the text.</li> </ul>

9.	Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion should clearly justify the significance of the results</li> <li>• It should co-relate the results to future expectations and signify earlier research findings.</li> <li>• Practical significance or theoretical implications of study area should be thoroughly discussed.</li> </ul>
10.	Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusion should be based on the objective and results of the paper.</li> <li>• The conclusion should be precise clearly identifying key points.</li> </ul>
11.	Acknowledgement	Check whether the authors have duly acknowledged the contributions and assistance rendered during the study.
12.	References	Reference citations must be complete in details, order and the format specified
13.	Presentation and Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The manuscript should be rationally written with reasonable vocabulary and organized nicely.</li> <li>• The contents should be completely compatible representing accurate and appropriate data.</li> <li>• Tables and figures must be impressive and attractive in conformity with the text.</li> <li>• The manuscript pages and other specifications should follow standard requirements of the journal.</li> </ul>