REVIEWER GUIDELINES

The following guidelines are intended as a reference tool for reviewers of IJRAP.

• Peer review of manuscripts requires vigilant consideration, and is essential to assure high quality content.

• Reviewer comments are blinded, and their identities are not known by the Author(s) of the manuscript.

• Reviewer comments should be as complete and detailed as possible and contain clear opinions about strengths, weaknesses, relevance, and importance to the field.

• Specific comments that cite manuscript sections, pages, paragraphs, or lines are exceptionally useful.

• Reviewers should consider themselves mentors of the Author(s). Reviewer comments should, therefore, be constructive and be offered for purposes of enhancing the manuscript.

• Reviewers should NOT reveal, cite, or in any way disclose information about a manuscript prior to its publication.

• Reviewers should NOT agree to review a manuscript if there is an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Questions to Consider During Your Review

• Is the information presented of significant interest to the readership?

• Is the title of the manuscript accurate, and does it sufficiently describe the content of the manuscript?

• Are the methods appropriate and scientifically sound?

• If the manuscript is based on data, do the data represent an adequate population? Is a valid statistical justification included to support the conclusions?

• Are appropriate statistical tests used?

• Are the tables and figures well designed? Do they add to the understanding of the text? Is the information presented in the tables and figures unnecessary?

• Are the references cited the most appropriate to support the manuscript?

Send Recommendation of A Decision on Manuscript to the Editor

After carefully observing the manuscript, Reviewers should give their decision about the manuscript to the Editor. Reviewers should give as many details as possible to support their recommendation.

• If reviewer Accept the manuscript it indicates that the Reviewer believes the manuscript should be published as it is.

• if reviewer submits a recommendation to Revise the manuscript it indicates that the Reviewer believes the Author(s) need to revise the manuscript, either substantially or partially, before it can be considered for publication. IJRAP Editor-in-chief has the right to take decisions of Major Revision and Minor Revision; Reviewers should indicate their preferred level of revision.

•If reviewer submits a recommendation to Reject the manuscript it indicates that the Reviewer believes the manuscript should NOT be published.

• Choose a recommendation of Accept, Reject, or Revise from the pull-down menu, and then give the manuscript an overall rating between 1 and 100.

• Reviewers have to give rating to the manuscript on a scale of 1 to 5 based on above mentioned parameters.

• Reviewers must indicate any potential conflicts of interest in manuscript, if any.