Reviewer Guidelines

- ***Why Review Process?***

  To ensure the originality and validity of the content peer review processing is conducted.

- ***The Keynotes before you consider accepting to review***

  The important criteria you must notice is the level of review you may able to complete and provide a justified review within the deadline or not.

  After you download the paper, read it quickly for an overview; then set it aside for a day or two to think about it. When you have sufficient time a few days later, give the manuscript a thorough reading perhaps making notes along the margins or within the manuscript itself. You may want to set it aside again for a day or two before preparing your written report.

  When preparing your written report you should remember the two roles of a reviewer:
  (1) Make a recommendation to the handling editor. While editors do take reports seriously, they do not always accept the recommendation of the reviewers, particularly when two or more reviewers have diverse opinions.

  (2) The reviewer should assist the author in improving his/her manuscript so that it is acceptable for publication. If the reviewer feels that the manuscript will not be acceptable for publication even if revised, the reviewer should still make suggestions to the author for future efforts.

- ***Provide Step by Step Reviews***

  Investigate the originality and validity of the content.

  Check for the quality of Language and Grammar since it is the foundation to understand the content.

  Indicate both the strength and weakness of the manuscript. This will allow author understand the Pros and Cons of his work.

Suggest the guidelines to overcome the major flaws of the manuscript.

- ***Make the final recommendation***

Accept/ Minor Revision/Major Revision/ Reject

Please provide valid reasons to justify the recommendation.

INITIAL COMMENTS

The first paragraph or two should summarize the paper thus letting the author know that you have carefully read the paper. An example would be "In this paper the authors have studied xxxx. The method (technique, approach) used is xxxx. The results show xxxx."

MAJOR ITEMS

This section should list the major corrections necessary to make the manuscript acceptable for publication. The section can start with a general statement about major items lacking such as an adequate description of the methodology or experimental equipment, insufficient references to provide an adequate background to the problem being discussed, etc. This should be followed by individual comments referring to the appropriate line number or paragraph in the paper.

MINOR ITEMS

This section may include a general paragraph such as "Please identify all acronyms when they first appear". "Please put the references used in the proper format for this journal (e.g. Harvard style vs.numbered references)." The remainder of the minor items should be listed by paragraph or line number. This would include recommended changes in sentence structure, misspelled words, a suggested reference addition, etc.

FINAL COMMENT

The final comments may be a summary or a major evaluation. For example if the reviewer feels the English should be improved, the reviewer should suggest that the manuscript be edited by someone fluent in written English (assuming that English is not the native language of the authors). If the reviewer

knows or believes that the author is a young author, words of encouragement could be included here. Complete references mentioned in the report should be included here if not embedded in the previous text. The recommendation to the editor can be included in this section or in a private message to the editor

EVALUATION CRITERIA

MINOR REVISION

Minor revisions are typically changes that might take the author a day or two to incorporate in the manuscript. These would include perhaps only one major suggestion in the written review and several minor suggestions. An example of a single major item that might lend itself to an overall minor revision recommendation would be formatting or additional descriptions necessary.

MAJOR REVISION

A major revision is when the author will have to spend considerable time in revising the manuscript. A suggestion to repeat the process using a new or different data set or technique would warrant a Major revision decision. A request to include a section on comparing the results with the work of previous authors, thus requiring a major literature search, would be a Major revision. Extremely poor English would also require a Major revision.

REJECT

It is usually more difficult to suggest a manuscript be rejected than to suggest a major revision. Assuming that the paper was submitted in good faith, the reviewer must make it very clear why the manuscript must be rejected. Valid reasons for rejection are the following:

Plagiarism

If sections of the paper have been lifted from a previous publication the paper should be rejected. If the sections are lifted from a previous paper by the same author, the reviewer should make certain that these are limited to such items as a description of an experiment, etc. Even in these cases, the wording should be changed somewhat. (It is difficult to describe a specific experiment in several different ways, so this requires caution by the reviewer.)

Flawed Analysis

If the analysis is seriously flawed the manuscript should be rejected. This covers a large area such as incorrect mathematical analysis, methodology that does not support the conclusions, incorrect interpretation of the results of others, many mistakes within the entire manuscript making the results questionable, etc. Examples must be given.

Results Previously Published by Others

If these results have been previously published by others (indicating that the authors did not either know of the previous publication or decided not to mention it), just say that the results have been published earlier and cite the publication.

No New Results

If the manuscript is simply as re-hash of previous work by the same authors with no clear new results.

Incremental Results

Some authors try to publish the "least publishable result" simply updating previous work with a small amount of new data typically supporting their previous published results. Unless there is a decidedly different and new result, this practice should be discouraged and the paper rejected.

- ***Maintain Confidentiality***

  Content must be confidential and not misused.

- ***Provide unbiased review***

  Never provide biased review as it will affect the quality of the enhancement of the manuscript.