



JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH (REVIEWERS GUIDE)

Information to Reviewers:

Peer review is a critical factor in promoting the rigor and high quality of scientific research. The entire scientific community benefits when the peer-review process is timely, thorough, and balanced.

The editors of Journal of Experimental Research, greatly appreciate the collective contribution that reviewers make to our journal and the articles they publish. We hope that the guidelines described below will help facilitate peer review as an essential element of the publication process.

The reviewers are to be guided by the following:

1. The objectivity of peer-review and public confidence should be preserved in impartiality.
2. Reviewers may not use the unpublished information in manuscripts they are reviewing as resources for their own research interests.
3. JER will not disclose the identity of any reviewer to the authors.
4. Reviewers must preserve the confidentiality of unpublished manuscripts.
5. Editorial consistency and fairness to authors necessitates that referees (reviewers) who reviewed the initial version of an article, remains committed to reviewing (re-reviewing) the corrected (revised) versions of the article.

Does the Manuscript conform to the following criteria?

- 1) Is the submission **original**? Yes No
- 2) Is the research cutting edge or topical? Yes No
- 3) Does it help to expand or further research in this subject area? Yes No
- 4) Does it significantly build on (the author's) previous work? Yes No
- 5) Does the paper fit the **scope** of the journal? Yes No
- 6) Should the paper be shortened and reconsidered in another form? Yes No
- 7) Would the paper be of **interest** to the readership of the journal? Yes No
- 8) Is there an **abstract** or brief summary of the work undertaken as well as a **concluding section**? Is the paper complete? Yes No
- 9) Is the submission in **Standard English** to aid the understanding of the reader? Yes No
- 10) Is the methodology presented in the manuscript and any analysis provided both **accurate** and properly conducted? Yes No

11) Do you feel that the **significance and potential impact** of a paper is high or low? Yes No

12) Are all **relevant** accompanying data, citations, or references given by the author? Yes No

Provide detailed comments for the Authors.

- These should be suitable for transmission to the authors: use the comment to the author as an opportunity to seek clarification on any unclear points and for further elaboration.
- If you have time, make suggestions as to how the author can improve clarity, succinctness, and the overall quality of presentation.
- Confirm whether you feel the subject of the paper is sufficiently interesting to justify its length; if you recommend shortening, it is useful to the author(s) if you can indicate specific areas where you think that shortening is required.
- It is not the job of the reviewer to edit the paper for English, but it is helpful if you correct the English where the technical meaning is unclear.

REVIEWER'S FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Once you've read the paper and have assessed its quality, you need to make a recommendation to the editor regarding publication.

Kindly select from the following recommendation, the one that fits the article most

Accept – if the paper is suitable for publication in its current form.

Minor revision – if the paper will be ready for publication after light revisions. Please list the revisions you would recommend the author makes.

Major revision – if the paper would benefit from substantial changes such as expanded data analysis, widening of the literature review, or rewriting sections of the text.

Reject – if the paper is not suitable for publication with this journal or if the revisions that would need to be undertaken are too fundamental for the submission to continue being considered in its current form.