

PEER REVIEW AND PUBLICATION POLICY

Review Policy

General Policies and Procedures

Authors submit their manuscripts electronically via emails to the Corresponding Editor. Each manuscript is reviewed by internal reviewers for relevancy to the individual Journal, and notified to the authors in the abstract review form for further action.

If any issues, the Corresponding Editor will contact the Editor in Chief (or an appropriate Editor), who will decide whether the manuscript should be transferred to another Journal published by i-manager Publications, editorially rejected owing to scope, or retained for review by the Journal to which it was submitted. If retained, the manuscript is assigned to an editor, who in turn chooses one or more editorial board members or reviewers to review it.

On receipt of the invitation to review,

- Reviewers read the editor's e-mail, which includes the article abstract, to determine whether the subject is within their area of expertise and whether they can complete the review in the stated time period.
- Accept or decline the invitation to review.

If declining the invitation to review:

- Reviewers indicate why they are declining.
- If possible, they suggest a colleague who may be able to review the manuscript. If appropriate, the editor will send an invitation to review to that individual. Reviewers may not "transfer" Editor's invitation to review the manuscript to a colleague.

If Reviewers accept the invitation to review, they will have access to the complete manuscript and should immediately:

- See whether there is any conflict of interest and whether they can judge the article impartially.
- See through the relevant portions of the manuscript and verify that it fits within the scope of the Journal.

If they have either a time problem or a conflict of interest, they should contact the editor for instructions regarding extending the deadline or canceling the review assignment as appropriate. If reviewer's examination reveals that the manuscript does not fit within the scope of the Journal, they indicate that in the review form.

The manuscript provided for review is a privileged document, to be protected from any form of exploitation.

The Review

Positive, impartial, but critical attitude towards the manuscript under review is appreciated.

Reviewers consider the following aspects when reviewing a manuscript:

- Significance to the target scientific community
- Originality
- Appropriateness of the approach or experimental design
- Appropriateness of the statistical analyses
- Appropriate literature citations
- Adequacy of experimental techniques
- Soundness of conclusions and interpretation
- Relevance of discussion
- Organization
- Adherence to the Instructions to Authors
- Adequacy of title and abstract
- Appropriateness of figures and tables
- Appropriateness of supplemental material

PEER REVIEW AND PUBLICATION POLICY

- Length prescribed

Some of the items for which they should be alert include:

- **Plagiarism:** Plagiarism is not limited to the Results and Discussion sections; it can involve any part of the manuscript, including figures and tables, in which material is copied from another publication without attestation, reference, or permission.
- **Missing or incomplete attestation:** Authors must give appropriate credit to ideas, concepts, and data that have been published previously. This is accomplished by the inclusion of references. Missing, incomplete, or incorrect references must be brought to the editor's attention.
- **Dual submission and/or publication:** Reviewers should be wary of attempts to submit/publish similar material more than once. This is often difficult to detect "before the fact," but checking literature citations, as well as having a critical eye, is helpful.

Publication Policy

Reviewer's criticisms, arguments, and suggestions concerning the paper will be most useful to the editor and to the author if they are carefully documented. Dogmatic, dismissive statements, particularly about the novelty of the work are to be avoided, and reviewers should substantiate their statements. Reviewers will be asked to suggest acceptability as noted on the specific review form.

In comments intended for the author, Reviewers organize their review so that an introductory paragraph summarizes the major findings of the article and gives overall impression of the paper, and highlights the major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments, which, if appropriate, may be subdivided into major and minor points (As per review form attached).

- Very few papers qualify for an immediate, unconditional acceptance.
- There are many reasons to reject a paper. In general, if there are serious flaws in experimental design, incorrect interpretation of data, extensive additional experiments required, or any organizational or English usage flaws that prevent critical review of the manuscript, then reviewers recommend that the manuscript be rejected.
- If reviewers feel that the deficiencies can be corrected within a reasonable period of time, then they recommend modification (e.g., accept with revision; or re-review required, if the revisions are extensive).

Reviewers advise the editors of their recommendation for acceptance, modification, or rejection of the manuscript. Reviewer's recommendations are gratefully received by the editor; however, since editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editor to honor every recommendation. The final decision regarding modification, acceptance, or rejection of a manuscript rests solely with the editor.