Reviewer Guidelines

Peer review is done to improve the quality of the manuscript under review. Though peer review is a time-consuming task, but it is very essential to assure the quality of scientific journal and manuscripts published therein. The journal is very grateful and acknowledges the time and efforts invested by Reviewers in the review process.

The reviewer is bestowed with responsibility of critically reading and evaluating the manuscript in hand. They are encouraged to provide respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their manuscript. In the process of peer reviewing, Reviewers are requested to comment in a way that encourages authors to improve the strength and quality of the work.

The journal uses a wide range of sources to identify potential reviewers. The sources include the members of editorial board, their contacts, scientific work available in public domains, personal contacts, bibliographic databases, potential reviewers as suggested by Authors. Reviewers' assessment and their comments play a major role in the decision regarding acceptance or rejection of manuscripts

Reviewers' must consider following points while accepting and reviewing manuscript

- Reviews must be conducted fairly and objectively
- Reviewers must always avoid personal criticism of author.
- Criticism should always be objective and a possible way out should be suggested by Reviewer.
- Reviewer must always hide their identity. They must avoid any clue that can reveal their identity
- Reviewer must decline the offer to peer review if any conflicting interest arises
- They must maintain confidentiality of the manuscript and the process as a whole
- Reviewer needs to fill a form during peer review of manuscript
- Reviewer can also comment or write to editor

Reviewers are requested to consider following points in reviewing any manuscript

- Is the topic of the manuscript significant and appropriate for the Journal?
- Does the manuscript comply with the Instructions for Authors?
- Do the title, abstract, key words, introduction, and conclusions reflect the core issues of manuscript?
- Is the manuscript well written and free of major grammatical errors?
- Is the aim clearly stated and whether the methodologies were followed accordingly?
- Is the research ethical and is having appropriate consents from patients, boards or governments whichever is applicable?
- Are the results obtained social science analysed and conclusion drawn as per social science principles and interpretation?
- Is there any clue about manipulation in data or biasness in drawing conclusion?
- Are all tables and figures clearly labelled, self-descriptive, and understandable by users?
- Are conclusions supported with facts and data?

- Are the references cited appropriate to support the manuscript? Are references cited follow the reference style of Journal? Is any landmark work or citation missing in the manuscript?

COPE Guidelines for Peer Reviewers
https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers