

# **NATIONAL RESEARCH & JOURNAL PUBLICATION**

## **REVIEWERS GUIDELINES**

NRJP Journal is being supported by an honorable group of researchers and academicians who constitute a part of our Reviewer Board. They bring with them their valuable experience and critical acclaim in their respective fields of study both within the country and internationally.

The Reviewer Board holds an important position in NRJP Journals. The review process assigned by an Editor lies completely in their hands. Their decision for any manuscript is always appraised by the Editorial board. In case there is ever any dispute in the Reviewers and Editors decision then Publication Management Team takes part in decision making.

Reviewer's Board facilitates review of complete assigned manuscripts, from the unassigned till a review comment for the article but final decision is always made by the Editorial Board. Reviewers and seeking their comments, providing the final comment and decision like Accept, Revision required, resubmit, reject for the article.

### **REVIEWER POLICY**

Reviewer board is a very privileged and honorable position in Journal Publication. As manuscript is a valuable document and needs to be protected from any exploitation. But just for the betterment of our system, please find our Reviewer policies cited below:

- Reviewers are always requested not to cite, refer and refrain from using the information it embodies for advancement of their own research.
- Reviewers should consciously adopt a positive and impartial attitude towards the manuscript under review.
- In case a Reviewer feels that the related manuscript is not of their interest then they should inform the Editor about the same or should send an email at [info@nrjp.co.in](mailto:info@nrjp.co.in)
- NRJP Journals review should be carried out as per the time lines. In case there are too hard deadlines then we will inform the concerned Editor accordingly.
- We request you to not discuss the manuscript with the Authors directly. Our user friendly system intimates the Author about every action being taken on his manuscript and then we follow from there.
- NRJP Journals, Publication Management Team expects the Reviewer to monitor the status of manuscript especially for the decision as Revision, Acceptance, and Rejection of the article.
- Reviewer's decision is the only final decision for any manuscript but in case there is any dispute then the advice will be taken from the Advisory Board and the decision will be taken by the Publication Management Team.
- Critical comments should be dispassionately in the comments intended for Authors and harsh remarks avoided.
- Reviewer Boards any review comment should not be implied as conditions of Acceptance. The final decision as Accept, Reject or Revision required will be taken by the Editorial board
- NRJP Journals does not expect any comments from the Reviewer board regarding Grammar check, layout or English corrections as we have a separate team dedicated for the same but yes any assistance for the same will be highly appreciated.
- NRJP Journals Publication management Team is always thankful to all the Reviewer comments.

## **KEY POINTS FOR THE SUITABILITY OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

- Originality-The manuscript should have proper references to signify the addition or support of the research already published or available through literature.
- Suitable for the Journals as per its Scope.
- Accurate Abstracts and keywords
- Author Guidelines should be properly followed.
- Suitability in approach of experimental design, accuracy of experimental techniques, methods, results etc.
- Appropriate Conclusion
- Relevance citation and their up to date.
- Relevance of figures and titles
- Clarity of legends and titles
- Presentation altogether, considering writing style, clarity in expression.

### **BENEFITS FOR THE REVIEWER**

We will also give 10% discount for institutional subscription in case the subscription is referred by a Reviewer. In addition we have other referral benefits for all the Reviewer board members which you can confirm us at [info.nrjp@nrjp.co.in](mailto:info.nrjp@nrjp.co.in)

### ***ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEWERS***

All peer reviewers must make every reasonable effort to adhere to enlisted ethical guidelines for reviewing articles submitted to NRJP Journals:

- Reviewers must give unbiased consideration to the manuscript solely on the basis of its merits.
- Reviewers should bring to the journal editor's notice any potential conflict of interest with regards to the content of the research article, prior to reviewing the same.
- Reviewers must maintain confidentiality with reference to the manuscript, its research information and correspondence cited in the reference, if any. The manuscript should, in no case, be shared with a third party, external to the peer review process.
- Referees should develop a comprehensive and appropriately evidenced peer review report, with constructive feedback for the author to work on.
- Any statement, which might be impugning to any person's reputation, should be avoided.
- Reviewers should strive to stand up to the specified deadlines to ensure submission and publication in a timely manner.
- Reviewers should declare any significant similarity, if found between the article under consideration and any published paper of which they are aware.

### ***Duties of Reviewers***

#### ***Contribution to Editorial Decisions***

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.

***Promptness***

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.

***Confidentiality***

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.

***Standards of Objectivity***

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

***Acknowledgement of Sources***

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.

***Disclosure and Conflict of Interest***

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 resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.