# INFORMATION FOR REVIEWERS / PEER REVIEW POLICIES (IJAMS)

If you are interested to become reviewer for IJAMS, then please send your full CV (in English language only) along with list of all published papers to the editor at editoí@ijams.in . decide the reviewer purely on the basis of published papers (papers published in journals indexed in Web of Science, Scopus and ABDC etc.).

Peer review is essential for fostering the objectivity and excellence of scientific inquiry. The rapid, exhaustive, and impartial peer-review process is advantageous to the entire scientific community. The incredible collective contribution that reviewers make to our magazine and the articles they publish is immensely appreciated by the editors of IJAMS. The principles that are outlined below are intended to make peer review easier as a dialogue between authors and reviewers and as a crucial step in the publication process.

- IJAMS employs double-blind review, in which the names of the reviewer and author are kept secret from one another throughout the review process. Manuscripts are pre-screened by the editorial office before being sent to reviewers to ensure that they meet the requirements for publishing in IJAMS, which include conformance to the journal's goals and scope, nature of the study, originality of the results, quantity and quality of data, general conclusions, and presentation of the work in good English. The paper might be rejected at this point without review if it doesn't meet these requirements.
- The Editors in Chief will send manuscripts to a minimum of two experts they have selected for review. The editoí@ijams.in . sends out an email inviting reviewer for IJAMS. The title and abstract of the manuscript are mentioned in the invitation. The reviewer receives access to the complete paper once they've agreed to review it. Reviewers are encouraged to get in touch with the editorial office whenever they need further details or support. The journal aims for a first decision to be made within 6-8 weeks of receipt of the submission and the Editors-in- Chief make the final decision on publication.

**The content of the review**

The core of any review is an objective assessment of both the technical rigor and the novelty of the presented work. Key features of a review include:

- An outline of the conceptual advance over previously published work
- A specific recommendation
- The reasons for that recommendation
- A list of the paper's particular advantages and disadvantages. Referees are encouraged to comment on the accuracy and clarity of the numbers as well as the reliability of the statistical techniques used to interpret them in this regard. (If necessary, the editors can ask the authors for primary data to be used by the referees in these more in-depth assessments.)
- We also invite reviewers to point out whether the extra material is clearly arranged and closely related to the paper's primary ideas.
- Other topics worth talking about frequently include:

- Alternative hypotheses that are consistent with the available data
- The paper's potential audience (i.e., the relevant fields within the readership of the Journal)
- Balanced citation of the body of previous research. It is especially beneficial to add in-depth citations to the pertinent publications and data in the review's body when previously published work undermines the novelty of the present findings.

## Cover comments to the editors

Sending comments intended solely for the editors' eyes is an option if some particular sections of the report seem improper for presentation to the authors. However, not only in the comments to the editor, but also in the comments to the author as well, should be made clear indications of all general problems that affect the reviewer's overall suggestion. This involves questions concerning the degree of conceptual advancement or significance, but is not restricted to them. Generally speaking, the tone of the remarks made to the editors and the authors should be similar. According to the writers, the editorial choice should directly reflect the feedback they receive from the reviewers.

As an executive summary of the remarks to the authors, comments to the editor might support the editorial process in a more general context. Additionally, this is the right place to raise any concerns about potential ethical violations in the research itself or in the way it is presented. These problems could involve fraud or alleged data manipulation, plagiarism, duplication of papers, or unethical treatment of research participants or animals.

Reviews can and should be critical, but we advise reviewers to remember that dismissive language and individualized critiques could be interpreted as revealing bias or other motivations on the referee's behalf.

IJAMS's primary editorial objective is to ensure that the review process is timely and effective for the benefit of the whole scientific community. IJAMS often believes that 20 days is enough time to assess a manuscript. We do recognize that reviewers must balance a variety of priorities, though. We ask that the referee get in touch with the editorial office if heor she is willing to review the paper but would need more time than twenty days to do so. When a review is going to be late, it's crucial to let the editor know; an updated timeline for when the review will be submitted and a justification for the unexpected delay are almost always beneficial.

**It is important to preserve the objectivity of peer review and public confidence in its rigor and impartiality.** For this reason, we ask reviewers to be sensitive to the potential for conflicts of interest, both real and perceived. If any potential impediment to objectivity may exist, reviewers should either decline to review the paper or, in cases when they are uncertain, contact the editor for advice. It is certainly worth considering these issues if a manuscript

(a) originates from an author who has recently had close personal interactions (of a strongly positive or negative nature) with the reviewer,

(b) is identical to some subset of the reviewer's currently active research program, or

(c) Impacts a topic in which the reviewer has a financial interest. For example, if the reviewer is collaborating with one of the authors or is preparing to publish a paper that comes to conclusions that overlap those of the manuscript in question, s/he should decline to review it. These issues should be considered as thoroughly as possible based on the initial "Request to

Review" e-mail, which contains the author list, title, and abstract of the paper. On occasion, the initial "Request to Review" e-mail does not convey all the relevant information, and the potential conflict of interest is therefore not apparent until the referee agrees to review the paper and downloads the complete manuscript. In this situation, the referee should contact the editor immediately.

**In addition, reviewers may not use the unpublished information described in manuscripts they are reviewing as resources for their own research interests.**

Likewise, these data, methods, or hypotheses should not influence financial decisions, such as buying or selling stocks. Information that has already been presented as an abstract, at a conference, or in another publication is considered public knowledge and does not require this privileged treatment.

**Reviewers must preserve the confidentiality of unpublished work**.

Until it is formally published, any paper or abstract submitted for peer review remains a confidential document. Reviewers occasionally might think it would be beneficial to ask a colleague for extra counsel. In such circumstances, we request that the reviewer make advance contact with the editor so that the editor may have a chance to consider further information before to approving messages that might compromise confidentiality. Discussions of unpublished articles are not appropriate at journal clubs or lab meetings. In order to evaluate papers, reviewers can work with trainees (graduate students and post-docs), and we recognize that this collaboration serves as an essential training exercise. However, we request that reviewers limit the number of team members and list everyone who contributed in the "comments to the editors" section of their review. In any case, the secrecy of the report's contents and its veracity ultimately rest with the person who was first asked to evaluate the manuscript. We encourage referees to share the necessary standards and ethics for peer review, as specified in this paper, with participating reviewers.

**Reviewing (or re-reviewing) revised manuscripts**

We request that reviewers who agree to assess one version of a specific manuscript also commit to reviewing subsequent changes if necessary. This is for editorial consistency and fairness to the authors. We make every attempt to handle corrections editorially and to reduce fruitless resubmission cycles in an effort to lessen the associated strain.

**Points to be considered in review:**

Reviewers should address the following points and state whether they accept the document as is, reject it, or request "Huge revisions," "minor revisions," or "without revisions." In general, revisions are likely to be "Major Compulsory Revisions" if additional controls are needed to back up the claims or the interpretations aren't supported by the data, if additional research is needed that could change the conclusions, or if the methods were insufficient or there were statistical errors.

1. **Is the question posed original, important and well defined?** The writers' research question should be clear and understandable to the reader. Reviewers who discuss the uniqueness and significance of the work in the context of its subject are helpful to both editors and writers. Give sources if the research question isn't original because similar work has already been published. After reading the article, reviewers should reflect on what they have learned and determine whether the study has a clear conclusion.
2. **Are the data sounds and well controlled?** If you believe that improper controls have been employed, please express your concerns and offer possible solutions.

Controls when necessary. Please be specific if you believe that additional experimental or clinical data is needed to support the findings.

3. **Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the data?** The interpretation should objectively discuss the applicability of each result. Are there any excessively positive or negative interpretations? The study's conclusions should be reliable, directly related to the facts presented, and, where appropriate, should make reference to other pertinent works. Have the authors cited sources when appropriate?

4. **Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to allow others to evaluate and/or replicate the work?** Please comment on if the study's procedures, which should be precisely stated and repeatable by experts in the field, are appropriate. If statistical analysis has been done, state whether or not it needs to be particularly reviewed by a second reviewer with statistical knowledge.

5. **What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods?** If there are any ways that the study design could be improved to raise the standard of the findings, kindly share your thoughts. Please specify whether any more experiments are necessary. Please pay close attention to the validity and reliability of any unique experimental methodologies applied.

6. **Can the writing, organization, tables and figures be improved?** Although the editorial committee may also evaluate the written English's quality, if you believe it falls short of what is anticipated for a scientific publication, please let us know. Please propose changes if the manuscript's structure makes it illogical or difficult for readers to navigate. Please comment on if the data are presented in the best possible way; for instance, is a graph being utilized when a table would provide more clarity? Can the figures in their current state be published due to their excellent quality?

7. **When revisions are requested.** Any or all of the following causes may prompt reviewers to suggest revisions: To support the authors' conclusions, more data must be provided; the arguments based on the data already available must be better justified; or the paper's coherence and/or clarity must be enhanced.

8. **Are there any ethical or competing interests issues you would like to raise?** The study should adhere to the ethical guidelines for scientific/medical research, and the authors should state, where necessary, that they have obtained ethics approval or patient consent. Despite the fact that we don't anticipate reviewers to dive into the authors' conflicting interests, if you are aware of any problems, you feel haven't been appropriately addressed, please contact the editorial office.

Last updated: 18/7/2023

********