

## Reviewer Guidelines

- Reviewers should respond within stipulated time frame, which is two weeks for the journal.
- Reviewers should try to fill in all the parts of reviewers report so that a fair judgment regarding the quality of the paper can be made.
- As review is essential step towards publication process, every reviewer is therefore supposed to be fair in reviewing.
- Any reviewer who feels him/herself as unqualified, or not having judgment. Idea or deficit of time should inform editor promptly, so that the paper can be forwarded elsewhere.
- The review should be objective one, and personal feelings, judgments or biasness should not affect the review and its outcomes.
- A reviewer should not review a paper that discusses any point that might have conflict of opinion with reviewer.
- No manuscript should be reviewed which is authored, co-authored or authored by some known person/s, in order to avoid biasness.
- A manuscript sent for review is confidential document, so it should be treated fairly and secretly and should not be shown somewhere else.
- Reviewers should comment on each point clearly so that the judgment regarding acceptance/rejection or changes may be made on the basis of review.
- If reviewer notices any similarity with any other paper published in any other journal, containing same contents and that issued should be addressed to editor.
- While reviewing the paper the reviewer must ensure the following key points
  - Originality of the Work,
  - Contribution to field and technical quality of research.
  - Clarity of presentation and dept of research.

Please fill all areas and send back to  
[editor.irecs@gmail.com](mailto:editor.irecs@gmail.com)  
[editor@irecsjournal.com](mailto:editor@irecsjournal.com)

**PART A: Editorial Office Only**

**SECTION I**

**PART B: Reviewer Only**

**SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript**

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| General comment: |  |
| Introduction:    |  |
| Methodology:     |  |
| Results:         |  |
| Discussion:      |  |

**SECTION II (Cont.)**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Bibliography/References: |  |
| Others:                  |  |
| Decision:                |  |

**SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)**

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Originality:               |  |
| Contribution To The Field: |  |
| Technical Quality:         |  |
| Clarity of Presentation :  |  |
| Depth of Research:         |  |

**SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark with an X)**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Accept As Is:                              |  |
| Requires Minor Corrections:                |  |
| Requires Moderate Revision:                |  |
| Requires Major Revision:                   |  |
| Submit To Another Publication Such As:     |  |
| Reject On Grounds of (Please Be Specific): |  |

**SECTION V: Additional Comments**

Please add any additional comments (Including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):