

Guidelines for Reviewers of SAARC Journal of Tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS

Reviewing a manuscript is time consuming and needs a sense of responsibility. However, it is exciting and enjoyable educational experience to review the manuscript written by the fellow scientist. Reviewing a manuscript is also a privilege. SAARC Journal of Tuberculosis, Lung Diseases and HIV/AIDS and its editors, authors and readers would like to thank your willingness to review the manuscripts. The Journal hopes that this guideline will be helpful to you.

General Policies and Procedures

1. Authors submit their manuscripts either via email or electronically via its online manuscript submission.
2. The manuscript is reviewed by the SAARC Journal of Tuberculosis, Lung Diseases and HIV/AIDS staff for relevancy to the scope of the journal. The editor checks the concepts, quality of scientific content, originality and most importantly adherence with Instructions to Authors.
3. If the manuscript is retained, it is assigned to an editor, who in turn chooses one or more editorial board members or ad hoc reviewers to review it.
4. Reviewers will get a request e-mail regarding his/her availability to review the manuscript with all the instructions.
5. Generally the editor's e-mail includes the abstract and the deadline for review, to determine whether the subject is within reviewer's area of expertise and whether he/she can complete the review in the stated time period. A link is provided for reviewer to log in with the user name and password.
6. If reviewer wishes to review the article then he/she needs to login as a reviewer in the website (www.saarctb.org) where the manuscript will be loaded.
 - He/she should **accept** to review the manuscript.
 - Should download the manuscript and the supplementary files, if any.
7. If reviewer declines to review, he/she should indicate the reason behind declining.

8. If possible he/she should recommend a colleague, but not transfer the manuscript to his/her colleague who may be able to review the manuscript.
9. The editor will initiate the same process (4 to 9) with the new reviewer.

Review Process

10. The reviewer accepting to review the manuscript should immediately check the title page and acknowledgement to determine whether there is conflict of interest for him/her. If he/she has conflict of interest, immediate contact to the editor should be made. Editor may cancel the review assignment.
11. If reviewer has a time problem, he/she should contact the editor. Editor may extend the time or cancel the assignment.
12. Then reviewer should check whether the manuscript fits within the scope of the journal.
13. The reviewer should fill the reviewer's form and send it back to the editor.
14. Reviewer should protect the document from exploitation. He/she should not cite the work under review before it has been published. Reviewer should use the information in the manuscript for the advancement of his/her research. Reviewer should not discuss regarding the manuscript with his/her colleagues.
15. Reviewer will not give the decision of acceptance of the manuscript. He/she should ask author to make necessary changes in the manuscript and do not express as condition of acceptance.
16. Reviewer should summarize the major findings of the manuscript, an overall impression of the manuscript and highlight major shortcomings. The comments should be numbered into major and minor points which facilitate both the editor's letter to author and evaluation of author's denial. Criticism should not be presented dispassionately and offensive remarks should not be made.
17. Reviewer should advise the editor of his/her recommendation for acceptance, modification, or rejection. However, the final decision is solely with editor.
18. Reviewer's criticisms, arguments, and suggestions regarding the manuscript will be most useful to the editor and to the author if they are carefully documented.

19. After completing your review, upload the file and click the **Submit Review button**.

20. The Reviewer should have a positive, impartial, but critical attitude toward the manuscript under review, with the aim of promoting effective, accurate, and relevant scientific communication. Please consider the following aspects when reviewing a manuscript:

- Originality
- Significance to the target scientific community
- Adequacy of title and abstract
- Adherence to the Instructions to Authors
- Organization
- Adherence to correct scientific nomenclature
- Appropriateness of the approach or experimental design
- Adequacy of experimental techniques
- Appropriateness of the statistical analyses
- Appropriate literature citations
- Relevance of discussion
- Soundness of conclusions and interpretation
- Appropriateness of figures and tables
- Appropriateness of supplemental material intended for posting (if applicable)
- Length

21. Reviewer is not expected to correct style or grammar, but any help in clarifying meaning is appreciable. It is expected to point out the use of scientific jargon, misspellings of chemical names, use of misspelled, incorrect, or outdated scientific names of organisms, and use of outmoded terminology or incorrect genetic nomenclature.

22. SAARC Journal of Tuberculosis, Lung Diseases and HIV/AIDS is a peer reviewed Journal, hence the editorial decision is based on evaluations derived from various sources and reviewer should not expect the editor to honor his/her every recommendations

23. Reviewer will be asked to suggest acceptability as,

- Accept
- Reject: In general, if there are serious flaws in experimental design, incorrect interpretation of data, extensive additional experiments required, or any organizational or English usage flaws that prevent critical review of the manuscript, then recommend that the manuscript be rejected.
- Modify, convert to other types of manuscripts, accept with revision: In case the deficiencies can be corrected within a reasonable period of time (6-8 weeks)
- Rereview required: if the revisions are extensive enough to warrant a second review

Publication Policies and Ethics

The publication policies and Ethics have been mentioned in Instructions to Authors section and the Journal relies on reviewers to detect any breach in publication policy and ethics after publication. Some items reviewers should know include:

- Plagiarism: Plagiarism in any part of the manuscript should alert the reviewer.
- Missing or incomplete attestation: Authors must credit concepts, ideas and the data that have been used from previously published articles which should be done by citing references.
- Dual submission and/or publication
- Conflicts of interest: reviewer should be aware of any commercial affiliations, consultancies, stock or equity interests, or patent-licensing

arrangements on the part of the authors. If so he/she should bring them to the editor's notice.

- If any suspicions of violation of policies and ethics then reviewer must communicate with editors not with the author directly. SAARC Journal of Tuberculosis, Lung Diseases and HIV/AIDS has policies to resolve such problems.