**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, co-authored 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 depth of research.

**Please fill all areas and send back to**

**editor.assar@gmail.com**

**editorassar@asarcouncil.com**

**PART A: *Editorial Office Only***

**Paper Title: Paste paper title here please**

**SECTION I**

**PART B: *Reviewer Only***

**SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| General comment: |  |
| Introduction: |  |
| Methodology:  |  |
| Results: |  |
| Discussion: |  |

**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*)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accept As Is: |  |
| Requires Minor Corrections: |  |
| Requires Moderate Revision:  |  |
| Requires Major Revision: |  |
| Submit To Another Publication Such As: |  |
| Reject On Grounds of (Please Be Specific): |  |

#### SECTION V: Additional Comments

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