

Guidelines for Editors

CONTENTS

Serial No.	Content	Page No.
1	Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewer	3
1.1	Basic principle to which reviewer should adhere to	3
2	Expectation during review process	4
2.1	During review process	4
2.2	While preparing a report	5
3	General Yardsticks on Suitability of Manuscripts	6

JOURNALS PUB

1. Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewer

As a guardian of the research records a peer reviewer plays an important role in maintaining the integrity of the record. Peer review in its all form is important for the scientific community and it is a duty of the reviewer to adhere themselves to the highest standard of publication ethics. Reviewers are in a unique position to encourage the conduct of good research through their policies and processes. Peer reviewers play an important role in the review process and the process depends largely on the trust and requires everyone involved in the process to behave responsibly and ethically. The aim of this document is to set a standard guidelines to which a reviewer should adhere to during the process of reviewing. It is hoped that these guidelines will be helpful in fostering a responsible conduct of research.

1.1 Basic principle to which reviewer should adhere to

- Always agree to review those articles that falls under your area of expertise and of which you can carry out a review in a timely manner.
- A reviewer should always respect the confidentiality of the peer review and should in any circumstances disclose the content of the manuscript and the review process, except that is disclosed by the journal.
- A reviewer should not use the information from the review process or the manuscript for his or for any organizations advantage or disadvantage and should not discredit others under any circumstances.
- The reviewer should seek advice of the journal whenever it is necessary and should always declare all conflict of interest that arise during the process
- A reviewer should never work under the influence of the color, gender, nationality or religious or political beliefs of an author
- A reviewer should be constructive in remarks and should not hostile and should refrain themselves from making derogatory remarks
- A reviewer should provide journal with all the necessary and correct information about himself and impersonating someone is considered serious misconduct.

2. Expectation during review process

- It is the responsibility of the reviewer to reply in a timely manner especially in case if they cannot review the manuscript in the stipulated time.
- A reviewer should always notify the journal in case he don't have the subject expertise required to review the manuscript, they should also provide the journal with the area of expertise
- On agreeing to review a manuscript, they you do that in a timely manner and should inform the journal as soon as possible for any delay
- A Reviewer should always highlight any potential conflict of interest that may arise, and should seek advice of the journal if they feel that they are unsure of the situation
- A reviewer should review a manuscript afresh if the manuscript have been submitted again or if it has been already reviewed by some other journal
- A reviewer should decline to review a manuscript if he is unable to provide an unbiased review and should not accept the manuscript just for the sake of getting a sight of it

2.1 During review process

- A reviewer should notify the journal as soon as he discovers a conflict of interest or anything that might prevent them from giving an unbiased result.
- Do not associate others with the review of the manuscript without obtaining permission, however if they do associate someone in reviewing process they should give their names and review, and try to give credits for their efforts
- A reviewer should ensure that the review is not based on the personality of the author or is not influenced and is purely based on the originality and quality of content of the manuscript.
- A reviewer should not contact the author without the permission of the journal

2.2 While preparing a report

- It should be noted that managing editor is looking at them for knowledge, fair judgment, an honest review an assessment of strength and weakness in the manuscript
- Should always state sound reason for rejecting a manuscript and should not reject a manuscript under any influence other than the originality of work.
- A reviewer should not make derogatory remarks to the author and maintain the standard of ethics
- Be clear and suggest any further investigation if necessary to the managing editor of the journal

3. General Yardsticks on Suitability of Manuscripts

- Originality or novelty of the manuscript as well as if the manuscript has a potential to support scientific research that has been already published, subject relevance and reliability, importance in terms of application for the scientific community
- Review should also look for keywords and abstract and should look for the appropriateness of the above
- Appropriateness of the experimental design and techniques including statistical and analytical methods
- Soundness of conclusion and interpretation of results and clarity of message
- Writing style and clarity of the manuscript, and suitability of the manuscript as a whole