

Peer Review Policy

Neeta Sharma¹

¹SMIMER, Surat, India

DOI: 10.55489/njcm.140520233032

Key words: Editorial policy, quality of article, biomedical research, validity

ARTICLE INFO

Financial Support: None declared

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Received: 04-04-2023, **Accepted:** 21-04-2023, **Published:** 01-05-2023

Correspondence: Dr. Neeta Sharma (Email: drneetarakesh@yahoo.co.in)

Peer review is the process by which research manuscripts submitted for publication in medical journals are evaluated by experts in the same field or related fields. The purpose of peer review is to assess the quality of the research and validate the findings of the research, identify any potential flaws or errors in methods or reporting, and provide constructive feedback to authors to improve the manuscript. It's a critical step in ensuring the quality and integrity of scientific research. It helps to ensure that published research is accurate, reliable, and of high quality, and helps to maintain the credibility and reputation of the scientific community.

Submissions Considered for Peer-Reviewed

Manuscript which undergoes peer-review are Original Articles, Short Articles/ Communications, Letters to Editor, Review Articles, Perspectives, Technical Reports and CMEs. Peer review of other article is at the discretion of the editors.

Review Process

Whole peer-review process is through the online editorial management system of the journal. The submission is also through online system only.

All submitted manuscripts are assessed by the editorial staff. Those manuscript which are out of the scope of the journal, does not fulfil the journal article format, or violating editorial policies are declined outright without eternal review. Manuscripts found interesting for our reader are sent for formal peer review.

Initially title and abstract send to the potential reviewers and those who agrees, a full text blinded manuscript send for the review. Reviewers are asked give comments and suggest rectifications, if required. Generally, manuscript is reviewed by two to three reviewers. Decision regarding the article is taken by the editors based on the reviewers' recommendations, the strength of the arguments presented by reviewer, response of the author, and or other information available in other literature.

In case the editor think that the corrections required in the manuscript before acceptance, the manuscript is sent back to author with comments of reviewer and editor. Author is asked to submit revised manuscript within certain time.

The revised manuscript is again assessed by the editorial staffs and send to the reviewer again to review the manuscript considering the previous comments.

How to cite this article:

Sharma N. Peer Review Policy. Natl J Community Med 2023;14(5):274-275.

DOI: 10.55489/njcm.140520233032

Copy Right: The Authors retain the copyrights of this article, with first publication rights granted to Medsci Publications.

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike (CC BY-SA) 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, adapt, and build upon the work commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given, and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

www.njcmindia.com | pISSN09763325 | eISSN22296816 | Published by Medsci Publications

In certain instances, editors will not send a revised paper back to the reviewers if it appears the authors have not made a significant effort to address the issues raised.

The editors then select one of the following options, based on the feedback of the reviewers:

- Accept with or without editorial changes.
- Send the manuscript back to the authors so they can revise it to resolve the reviewer/reviewers' concerns before a final decision is made.
- Decline with specific reasons indicating to the authors that additional work may be required to justify a resubmission.
- Decline outright, typically based on lack of specialized interest, lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual progress, or significant technical and/or interpretive issues.

Selection of a Reviewer

The selection of reviewers for the peer review of the manuscripts is one of the most important tasks to maintain the highest quality of the research publications. Many factors are taken into consideration while selecting a reviewer which may include specialisation in the subject, scholarly publication record, previous review experience, our own experience with the reviewer, recommendations from others including the author, and academic & research background. Reviewers who are quick to respond, who give comments with reasoning, and who are from the same region where the study was conducted may get preference.

Authors are encouraged to suggest neutral judges who would be suitable for the role. Most of the time, the journal gives them preference, but the editor's decision regarding reviewers is final. When making proposals for peer reviewers, authors are highly encouraged to consider geographic location, research experience, publication experience, etc.

Review Response Time

We are committed to process manuscript rapidly and to reach an editorial decision as early as possible. An efficient editorial system is setup to hasten the editorial review. Reviewers are also asked to respond within certain time limit agreed upon.

Double blind Review

The NJCM employs a double-blind peer review process. The authors' and reviewers' identities are kept strictly confidential. To keep their manuscript anonymous, authors must follow the submission checklist.

[For Reviewer] Writing a Review Report

The primary objective of the review is to offer critiques of the manuscript that assist the editor in making a decision regarding the manuscript. The re-

view should also include suggestions for improving the quality of the manuscript. In the event of a negative review, significant flaws in the manuscript must be identified so that rejected authors can comprehend the decision and revise their work for submission elsewhere.

We suggest reviews the following means to evaluate various aspects of the manuscript:

Read the article carefully: Before you can write a review, take your time to fully understand the content of the article. Read it carefully, and make notes or highlights of any key points, arguments, or evidence presented.

Evaluate the article: Evaluate the quality of the article's objectives, methodology, analysis, and conclusions. Consider the following questions:

- Is the research question clear and well-defined?
- Is the methodology sound and appropriate for the research question?
- Are the results presented clearly and accurately?
- Is the reporting of data and methodology sufficiently detailed and transparent to enable reproducing the results?
- Is appropriate statistics used for analysis?
- Are the conclusions supported by the data and analysis presented?
- Do you feel that the results presented are of immediate interest to many people in your own discipline, and/or to people from several disciplines?
- Do you find that the conclusions and data interpretation are robust, valid, and reliable?
- Does this manuscript reference previous literature appropriately? If not, what references should be included or excluded?

Critique the article: In addition to evaluating the article's quality, also critique any weaknesses or limitations. Some questions to consider might include:

- Are there any biases or limitations in the study design or data collection?
- Are there any potential confounding factors that may have influenced the results?
- Are there any ethical concerns with the study design or conduct?

Provide recommendations: Based on your evaluation and critique, provide recommendations for future research or improvements in the study design.

Write your review report: Finally, organize your thoughts and write your review. Be sure to include a clear summary of the article, your evaluation and critique, and any recommendations you have. Use clear, concise language and provide specific examples or evidence to support your points.

We ask reviewer to always be respectful and objective in your review, focusing on the content of the article rather than the author.