

Guidelines for Reviewers

Introduction

The quality of the articles published by a Journal depends on the quality of the Reviewers and the entire Review Process. Suggestions, corrections and recommendations provided by the Reviewers are of immense importance in enhancing the quality of the research articles. In this regard IJTOS (International Journal of Trends in OncoScience) follows a blind peer review system.

Even before accepting to review a manuscript the Reviewers are requested to ensure that:

- The manuscript falls within their area of specialization/expertise.
- They can do justice to the work at hand by allocating sufficient time to do an objective and critical review of the manuscript.

Confidentiality

Strict confidentiality should be maintained regarding the content of the manuscripts and other matters related to manuscripts, and correspondences made with Editorial Staff. The manuscripts, comments from other peer-reviewers, correspondences made, should not be released to any unauthorized person/body/forum/website.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as: 'The practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own'. If Reviewers make use of information they acquire while reviewing the manuscripts for their own benefit or share the same to other individuals or organizations for personal benefit or advantage they would be performing an unethical deed equivalent to Plagiarism.

Objectivity

The reviewing assignment has to be done with sincerity and objectivity. Though Peer review would be done by blind peer review, journal tries its maximum to mask the author's identity and their affiliation and even if reviewers discover the authors identity at any part of the manuscript, they should not allow themselves to be influenced by:

- The author's nationality, gender, race or ethnicity
- The author's religious, cultural or political perspectives or views

Conflict of Interest

Throughout the peer review process there is a lot of scope for the emergence of conflicts of interest, which would mean conflict between the private interest of the individual and that of the common interest in the Scientific or Publishing activities.

If such conflicts of interests arise the Reviewers are requested to remove themselves from the peer-review process.

The following specific guidelines are an over view. A well detailed guideline would be sent to the respective reviewer during the peer review process. If the reviewer does not receive the detailed peer review guidelines (Screening Guidelines), he/she can request the journal to send the same for the peer review process.

This specific screening guidelines helps to review the manuscript for any error or lacuna or technical/scientific/logic etc requisite. Reviewers are also free to review more than these screening guidelines provided but they are expected to review towards error free manuscript. Detailed Screening guidelines is confidential for the reviewers and are available only for the review members.

The following Guidelines are an overview of our screening guidelines:

1. Title should be descriptive and apt to the study. It should be a clear representative of the whole manuscript.
2. Unnecessary lengthiness of the title should be cut short. Suggestion for short title is appreciated.
3. Abstract should be between 300 to 400 word limit without any side headings and should represent the whole manuscript. Should start with 1 to 2 introduction sentences followed by objective, methods, results (important results) with statistical analysis (P value), discussion and conclusion.
4. Introduction should discuss earlier and related researches and should have some references cited to support your objective or need of your study.
5. Methods should have clear description of each of the methods with appropriate reference. Necessary approvals, Authentications and permissions should be mentioned.
6. A separate paragraph of statistical analysis should be present (in case of research paper) should have a statistical analysis Paragraph. Result table should have relevant \pm SD or SEM values and at foot notes "P value" and "n" value should be present.
7. Results should be present in the same order as that of the methods.
8. Check if necessary table, graphs, figures with numbers, captions, and title is present.
9. Discussion should discuss the results towards achieving the aim/objective of the study. It should cite references to support your findings. It should give possible mechanism of action etc with support from some references.
10. Conclusion should give authors point of concluding reports about the study with emphasis of future studies need to be done for beneficial of society /research.
11. References (journal or book or else) under the reference section, you should strictly follow journal reference style (For details visit http://www.ijlpr.com/complete_reference_style.pdf)
12. Check if the manuscript has any English language error or lacks any academic style.
13. The reviewer is required to suggest specific comments to upgrade the manuscript and avoid any derogatory remark.
14. Reviewers are expected to fill the comments form sent along with the manuscript and to answer each and every questions pertaining to the manuscript mentioned in the comments form.

Review reports

The Reviewers are requested to make a fair and objective review of all the aspects expected of a research manuscript like:

- Content
- Originality
- Relevance of the findings
- Data analysis and interpretation
- Clarity of Presentation
- Coherence of ideas
- Language of Presentation

The Review report should offer

- constructive criticism
- accurate and clear instructions without any ambiguity
- useful suggestions based on facts
- relevant recommendations

Instead of just making statements appreciating or criticizing, they should suggest ways of improving the manuscript.

Derogatory and accusatory remarks on the manuscript or the author/s will NOT be entertained.

Reviewers are not expected to rewrite the manuscript; however necessary minor corrections can be made in the manuscript itself.

Recommendations

Recommendations made by the Reviewers could be any one of these:

- Manuscript can be accepted
- Manuscript requires minor corrections as suggested/instructed in the Review report
- Requires moderate revision as suggested/instructed in the Review report
- Requires major revision
- Not suitable for publication in this Journal.
- Manuscript cannot be Accepted for Publication (Reasons should be clearly stated)

Punctuality & Quality of time spent on Review:

Reviewers should be able to dedicate sufficient and quality time to review the manuscripts. And they are also asked to strictly adhere to the turn around time.

Resources

- P.I.E. Guidelines for Reviewers
- COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers
- ICMJE - Responsibilities in the Submission and Peer-Review Process
- WAME - Conflict of Interest in Peer-Reviewed Medical Journals