

Reviewer Guideline

Description

Reviewer Guidelines

Rigorous peer review is the cornerstone of academic publishing and fundamental to the development and integration of new research. We greatly appreciate reviewers for volunteering their time and expertise to review the submitted manuscripts of *IJSAC*.

——The *IJSAC* Editorial Team

Reviewers play an extremely important role in the peer review process. Efforts of reviewers are the key to the objectives of a fair and timely review process for all of our manuscripts and the publications of only papers of the highest quality. We greatly appreciate reviewers for volunteering their time and expertise to review the submitted manuscripts of *IJSAC*.

IJSAC performs blind reviews for manuscripts, so the identity of every reviewer is protected. Reviewers must treat the manuscripts as confidential documents, which must not be shown to or discussed with others except with the authors' permission.

Become a Reviewer

If you're interested in serving as a reviewer of *IJSAC*, please directly register and then change your role to a "reviewer".

Competing Interests

You should not accept a review assignment if you have a potential competing interest, including the following:

- Prior or current collaborations with the author(s)
- You are a direct competitor
- You may have a known history of antipathy with the author(s)
- You might profit financially from the work

Please inform the editors or journal staff and recuse yourself if you feel that you are unable to offer an impartial review.

Confidential Material

IJSAC performs blind reviews for manuscripts, so the identity of every reviewer is protected. Reviewers must treat the manuscripts as confidential documents, which should must not be shown to or discussed with others except with the authors' permission.

How to Conduct a Review

Accept or Decline to Review

Before you accept or decline an invitation to review, consider the following questions:

- Does the article match your area of expertise? Evaluate the paper based on the title and abstract, only accept if you feel you can provide a high-quality review.
- Do you have a potential conflict of interest? Disclose this to the editor when you respond.
- Do you have time? Please accept or decline any invitations quickly – it will prevent delays.

If you do decline the invitation, it would be helpful if you could provide suggestions for alternative reviewers.

Structuring Your Review

A four-part structure of moves is proposed for *IJSAC* review reports.

- **Move 1:** Summarizing judgment regarding suitability for publication
- **Move 2:** Outlining the article
- **Move 3:** Points of criticism (major issues and minor issues)
- **Move 4:** Conclusion and recommendation

Tips

?Give positive feedback first. Authors are more likely to read your review if you do so. But don't overdo it if you will be recommending rejection

?Briefly summarize what the paper is about and what the findings are

?Try to put the findings of the paper into the context of the existing literature and current knowledge

?Indicate the significance of the work and if it is novel or mainly confirmatory

?Indicate the work's strengths, quality, and completeness

?State any major flaws or weaknesses and note any special considerations. For example, if previously held theories are being overlooked

Major Issues

?Are there any major flaws? State what they are and what the severity of their impact is on the paper
?Has a similar work already been published without the authors acknowledging this?
?Are the authors presenting findings that challenge current thinking? Is the evidence they present strong enough to prove their case? Have they cited all the relevant work that would contradict their thinking and addressed it appropriately?
?If major revisions are required, try to indicate clearly what they are
?Are there any major presentational problems? Are figures & tables, language, and manuscript structure all clear enough for you to accurately assess the work?
?Are there any ethical issues? If you are unsure it may be better to disclose these in the confidential comments section

Minor Issues

?Are there places where meaning is ambiguous? How can this be corrected?
?Are the correct references cited? If not, which should be cited instead/also? Are citations excessive, limited, or biased?
?Are there any factual, numerical, or unit errors? If so, what are they?
?Are all tables and figures appropriate, sufficient, and correctly labelled?

Your review will help the editor decide whether or not to publish the article. It will also aid the author and allow them to improve their manuscript. Giving your overall opinion and general observations of the article is essential. Your comments should be courteous and constructive, and should not include any ad hominem remarks.

Providing insight into any deficiencies is important. You should explain and support your judgment so that both editors and authors can fully understand the reasoning behind your comments.

Your Recommendation

When you make a recommendation, it is worth considering the categories the editor will likely use for classifying the article:

- **Reject** (explain your reasoning in your report)
- **Accept** without revision
- **Revise** – either major or minor (explain the revision that is required, and indicate to the editor whether you would be happy to review the revised article). If you are recommending a revision, you must furnish the author with a clear, sound explanation of why this is necessary.

Your recommendation is visible only to journal editors, not to the authors. There will be the opportunity to direct separate comments to both the editor and author.

Rating the Manuscript

We will ask you to address specific questions in your review via a questionnaire and ask you to rate the manuscript on various attributes using a scorecard.

Please bear in mind the following questions – they'll help you form your overall impression:

- What is the main question addressed by the research? Is it relevant and interesting?
- How original is the topic? What does it add to the subject area compared with other published material?
- Is the paper well written? Is the text clear and easy to read?
- Are the conclusions consistent with the evidence and arguments presented? Do they address the main question posed?
- If the author is disagreeing significantly with the current academic consensus, do they have a substantial case? If not, what would be required to make their case credible?
- If the paper includes tables or figures, what do they add to the paper? Do they aid understanding or are they superfluous?
- Is the English language appropriate and understandable?

Contact

If you have questions or concerns about the manuscript you are reviewing, or if you need assistance submitting the review, please [email us](#).

Date Created

August 18, 2025

Author

admin