

## Reviewer Guidelines

**Reviewer:** The reviewer is an eminent person with subject expertise and plays an essential role in the peer review process ensuring the integrity of all the published material. The entire process depends upon the trust and involvement of the participating reviewers. The efforts of reviewers is the key to the objectives of a fair and timely review process for all of our manuscripts and publication of only the highest quality papers. All the participating peer reviewers should adhere to ethical responsibility. Their constructive comments and reports helps the editor to take a decision on the manuscript. We greatly appreciate reviewers for their help in meeting these important objectives.

**Peer Review:** is a collaborative process that allows manuscripts submitted in a journal to be evaluated and commented upon by independent experts within the same field of research. The evaluation and critique generated from peer review provide authors with feedback to improve their work and, critically, allows the editor to assess the manuscript's suitability for publication in the journal. A peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in his/her specialty field, and then providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their submission. It is appropriate for the Peer Reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work, and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript. The peer review process is not without its limitations; however, it still plays a fundamental role in helping to ensure published research is accurate, trustworthy, and meets the highest standards of research within a given field.

The peer review process may adopt one of the following forms:

1. **Single-blind review:** The reviewer's name isn't disclosed with the author.
2. **Double-blind review:** The identity of the reviewers and the authors aren't disclosed.

## Reviewing a Paper

As a reviewer, it is important that you remain objective in your critical appraisal. You should not allow your personal prejudice about research topics or researchers to influence your judgment. Your

comments should be professional and courteous, and should help the author to improve their paper and present their research as clearly and concisely as possible.

If you have reasons to believe that the material is not original or has been plagiarized, please alert the handling editor or the editorial office.

When reviewing a paper, you should take into consideration the following:

**Originality and Quality:** Is the paper of sufficient interest for publication in the journal? Does it contribute significantly to the current state of the research field? Is the topic handled substantively and accurately in appropriate detail and scope?

**Structure:** Abstract, introduction, method, results, conclusion.

**Language:** You do not need to correct the English, however, if a paper is difficult to understand due to grammatical errors, please mention this in your report.

### **Why should you become a peer reviewer?**

By acting as a reviewer you can:

1. Help authors improve their papers by providing your professional expertise. Gain a sense of prestige in being consulted as an expert.
2. Play an important role in maintaining a good, rigorous peer-review process.
3. Expand your awareness of the current research emerging in your field.
4. Build relationships and improve your academic and professional profile. Although often anonymous, the review process may enable a discussion (between author, reviewer, and editor) around a research field or topic.
5. Improve your own writing skills. Reviewing others work can make it easier to spot common errors in your own.

### **Responsibilities**

#### **Peer-reviewers responsibilities towards the authors**

1. Providing written, unbiased feedback in a timely manner on the scholarly merits and the value of the work, together with the documented basis for the reviewer's opinion.
2. Indicating whether the writing is clear, concise and relevant, and rating the work's composition, scientific accuracy, originality and interest to the journal's readers.
3. Avoiding personal comments or criticism.
4. Maintaining the confidentiality of the review process: not sharing, discussing with third parties or disclosing information from the reviewed paper.

### **Peer-reviewers responsibilities towards editors**

1. Notifying the editor immediately if unable to review in a timely manner.
2. Alerting the editor about any potential, personal or financial conflict of interest and declining to review when a possibility of a conflict exists.
3. Complying with the journal's expectations for the scope, content and quality of the review.
4. Providing a thoughtful, fair, constructive, and informative critique of the submitted work.
5. Determining the scientific merit, originality and scope of the work; indicating ways to improve it; and recommending acceptance or rejection.
6. Making a note of any ethical concerns, such as any violation of accepted norms of ethical treatment of animal or human subjects, or substantial similarity between the reviewed manuscript and any published paper or any manuscript concurrently submitted to another journal which may be known to the reviewer.
7. Refraining from direct author contact.

### **Make a Recommendation**

Once you've read the paper and assessed its quality, you need to make a recommendation to the editor regarding publication. The specific decision types used by a journal will vary but the key decisions are:

**Accept:** If the paper is suitable for publication without revision

**Minor Revision:** Are there places where meaning is ambiguous? How can this be corrected?

Are the correct references cited? If not, which should be cited instead/also? Are citations excessive, limited, or biased?

Are there any factual, numerical or unit errors? If so, what are they?

Are all tables and figures appropriate, sufficient, and correctly labelled? If not, say which are not?

**Major Revision:** Are there any major flaws? State what are they and what the severity of their impact is on the paper?

Has similar work already been published without the authors acknowledging this?

Are the authors presenting findings that challenge current thinking? Is the evidence they present strong enough to prove their case? Have they cited all the relevant work that would contradict their thinking and addressed it appropriately?

If major revisions are required, try to indicate clearly what are they?

Are there any major presentational problems? Are figures & tables, language and manuscript structure all clear enough for you to accurately assess the work?

Are there any ethical issues? If you are unsure it may be better to disclose these in the confidential comments section.

**Reject:** Give constructive feedback describing ways that they could improve the research.

Keep the focus on the research and not the author. This is an extremely important part of the job as a reviewer.

Avoid making critical confidential comments to the editor while being polite and encouraging to the author- the latter may not understand why their manuscript has been rejected. Also, they won't get feedback on how to improve their research and it could trigger an appeal.

## **Timeliness and Responsiveness**

Reviewers are responsible for acting promptly, adhering to the instructions for completing a review and submitting it in a timely manner. Failure to do so undermines the review process. Every effort should be made to complete the review within the time requested. If it is not possible to meet the deadline for the review, then the reviewer should promptly decline to perform the review or should inquire whether some accommodation can be made to resolve the problem.

1. Ensure proficient peer review process and submit reviews within the time-frame. Please inform the editor if you cannot do so.
2. Please do not delay the review process intentionally.
3. Editor will take a decision on the manuscript even if at least two reviews were received within the time-frame regardless the third Reviewer's report.
4. Contact the Editor for any additional documents in support to the manuscript.
5. Please do not edit any information from the manuscript content.
6. Please be confident and provide sound, constructive and unbiased reviews.
7. Please remember to acknowledge the good information in the manuscript.
8. Reviews should be objective and should not comprise any personal accusations.
9. Reviewers should clearly indicate if any confidential comments directed only to the Editor.
10. Avoid using unfair language or offensive criticism which is inappropriate for professional communication.
11. Please keep a copy of the review documents for your use in case a revision is submitted by the authors.
12. Please respond promptly with required information whenever the Editor contact you post review process regarding the reviewed manuscript.
13. Please be aware of the Journal's policies and guidelines.

## **Unable to review?**

It will prove impossible for you to accept every invitation to review. In this situation it is very helpful if you are able to recommend an alternative expert or someone whose opinion you trust. If you are unable to complete your report on a paper then inform the editorial office as soon as possible so that the reviewing process is not delayed. Make the editors aware of any potential conflict of interest that may affect the paper under review. We are always very grateful for the contribution made to our Journal by our reviewers and would be pleased to hear any comments or suggestions on our current peer review procedures.

### **Benefits for Reviewer**

On becoming a reviewer board member with us, you will actually expand your expertise area and establish yourself as a notable professional with exceptional skills. Reviewing is generally a lengthy and time taking process that needs utmost attention. Reviewing other papers of your related field polish your skills and expertise in that particular subject matter. Reviewing the other's work has a deep-rooted impact on your intellectual analytical and professional aspects. It opens new horizons for you as an individual.

There are great benefits of becoming a reviewer. You can:

1. Establish your expertise in the field and expand your knowledge.
2. Improve your reputation and increase your exposure to key figures in the field.
3. Stay up to date with the latest medical updates, and have advanced access to research results.
4. Develop critical thinking skills essential to research.
5. It improves your skills.
6. You will get a professional upliftment.
7. You will get all time and free access to our database.
8. You will contribute to the community.