



## 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](mailto:editor.assar@gmail.com)**

**[editorassar@asarcouncil.com](mailto: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):