

Review Process

1. Review process is triggered after a submission is received.
2. The submission is assigned a unique number for future reference and correspondence.
3. A confirmation email to the effect is sent out wherein the unique number is conveyed to the author/s.
4. Initial selection process starts either to accept or reject the manuscript for further review process.
5. If the article is rejected keeping in view its quality or scope, decision with reason/s is conveyed to the author/s.
6. If the article is selected, its plagiarism report is generated through Turnitin.
7. If the plagiarized work is beyond 19%, an email is sent out to the author/s to the effect to explain plagiarism in excess.
8. If the excess in plagiarism is sufficiently explained/justified to the satisfaction of editors or when the similarity index is at or below the permitted plagiarism [19%], the article is referred to at least two reviewers who have expertise in the corresponding field to comment upon.
9. Editors remove author's name, his/her institutional identity, and email address etc. to create an anonymous article to comply with the double-blind-peer-review policy of the journal.
10. Upon receipt of the anonymous article, a reviewer may, at initial stage, accept or reject the manuscript.
11. If the anonymous article is rejected, the rejection decision with reasons is conveyed to the author/s through editors keeping the identity of reviewer in secret.
12. The initial acceptance decision is also conveyed to the author/s. The identity of reviewer is again kept in secret.
13. A reviewer may either accept the manuscript as it is, with minor corrections, or with major changes.

14. The observations are conveyed to the author/s and a final confirmation of acceptance for publication is emailed after the manuscript is accepted as it is.
15. If the reviewer suggests minor or major changes, the observations in either case are conveyed to the author/s to incorporate the changes within a given time frame.
16. After incorporation of the changes on part of the author/s, the amended draft is emailed to the same reviewer to check if the comments are actually and properly reflected or incorporated in the new draft.
17. If the reviewer is not satisfied with the new draft due to the non-incorporation of the comments, the draft is emailed back to the author asking him/her to comply with reviewer's new observations, this series of communication continues until all observations are accommodated or reflected to the satisfaction of the reviewer.
18. After the reviewer is satisfied, a formal confirmation of acceptance to publish the manuscript is sent out through email to the author/s.