


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, coauthored 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.irss@gmail.com irsseditor@academyirmbr.com

PART A: *Editorial Office Only*

SECTION I PART B: *Reviewer Only*

SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript



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)



SECTION V: Additional Comments

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