



An International Journal House



EINSTEIN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ORGANIZATION

Contact us: editor@eiyo.in, Website: www.eiyo.in

A Group of DOI & DIDS

REVIEWERS GUIDELINE

Duties of Reviewers

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process. Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.

A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest.

Reviewer Roles and Responsibilities

Peer review is the principal mechanism by which the quality of research is judged. Most funding decisions in science and the academic advancement of scientists are based on peer-reviewed publications.

Peer-reviewer responsibilities toward editors

- Notifying the editor immediately if unable to review in a timely manner and providing the names of potential other reviewers.
- Alerting the editor about any potential personal or financial conflict of interest and declining to review when a possibility of a conflict exists.
- Complying with the editor's written instructions on the journal's expectations for the scope, content, and quality of the review.
- Providing a thoughtful, fair, constructive, and informative critique of the submitted work, which may include supplementary material provided to the journal by the author.
- Determining scientific merit, originality, and scope of the work; indicating ways to improve it; and recommending acceptance or rejection using whatever rating scale the editor deems most useful.
- Noting any ethical concerns, such as any violation of accepted norms of ethical treatment of animal or human subjects or substantial similarity between the reviewed manuscript and any published paper or any manuscript concurrently submitted to another journal which may be known to the reviewer.
- Refraining from direct author contact.



Peer-reviewer responsibilities toward authors

- Providing written, unbiased feedback in a timely manner on the scholarly merits and the scientific value of the work, together with the documented basis for the reviewer's opinion.
- Indicating whether the writing is clear, concise, and relevant and rating the work's composition, scientific accuracy, originality, and interest to the journal's readers.
- Avoiding personal comments or criticism.
- Maintaining the confidentiality of the review process: not sharing, discussing with third parties, or disclosing information from the reviewed paper.

Peer-reviewer responsibilities toward readers

- Ensuring that the methods are adequately detailed to allow the reader to judge the scientific merit of the study design and be able to replicate the study, if desired.
- Ensuring that the article cites all relevant work by other scientists.

Ethical Responsibilities of Reviewers

Confidentiality: Material under review should not be shared or discussed with anyone outside the review process unless necessary and approved by the editor.

Constructive Critique: Reviewer comments should acknowledge positive aspects of the material under review, identify negative aspects constructively, and indicate the improvements needed. Anything less leaves the author with no insight into the deficiencies in the submitted work. A reviewer should explain and support his or her judgment clearly enough that editors and authors can understand the basis of the comments. The reviewer should ensure that an observation or argument that has been previously reported be accompanied by a relevant citation and should immediately alert the editor when he or she becomes aware of duplicate publication.

Competence: Reviewers who realize that their expertise is limited have a responsibility to make their degree of competence clear to the editor. Reviewers need not be expert in every aspect of an article's content, but they should accept an assignment only if they have adequate expertise to provide an authoritative assessment. A reviewer without the requisite expertise is at risk of recommending acceptance of a submission with substantial deficiencies or rejection of a meritorious paper. In such cases, the reviewer should decline the review.

Impartiality and Integrity: Reviewer comments and conclusions should be based on an objective and impartial consideration of the facts, exclusive of personal or professional bias. All comments by reviewers should be based solely on the paper's scientific merit, originality, and quality of writing as well as on the relevance to the journal's scope and mission, without regard to race, ethnic origin, sex, religion, or citizenship of the authors.

Disclosure of conflict of interest: To the extent possible, the review system should be designed to minimize actual or perceived bias on the reviewer's part. If reviewers have any interest that might interfere with an objective review, they should either decline the role of reviewer or disclose the conflict of interest to the editor and ask how best to address it. Some journals require reviewers to sign disclosure forms that are similar to those signed by authors.



An International Journal House



EINSTEIN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ORGANIZATION

Contact us: editor@eijo.in, Website: www.eijo.in

A Group of DOI & DIDS

Timeliness and Responsiveness: Reviewers are responsible for acting promptly, adhering to the instructions for completing a review, and submitting it in a timely manner. Failure to do so undermines the review process. Every effort should be made to complete the review within the time requested. If it is not possible to meet the deadline for the review, then the reviewer should promptly decline to perform the review or should inquire whether some accommodation can be made to resolve the problem.

Join in Reviewer Panel

- We introduce ourselves as **EIJO** an initiative to provide an open access forum for researchers to publish their journals. All submitted papers are peer reviewed by international refereeing process.
- You are invited to join on the reviewers list of the journal. All selected reviewers must adhere and follow the guidelines formed by **EIJO** editorial board.

Qualification of Reviewer

- P.G. Degree with **eight** year teaching/research experience and minimum **ten** research papers must be published or Ph. D. (Doctor of Philosophy) with at least **five** years teaching/research experience with minimum **five** research papers must be published of expertise in respective field of research.
- If you are interested to join **EIJO** as a reviewer, please send your **CV** and a brief summary of your specific expertise and interests at editor@ijergs.in or **join us** now.