Instructions for Reviewers

We thank Reviewers for visiting the Manuscript Review Instruction of RALF.

Quality of any journal mainly depends upon the quality of evaluation by its Editorial / Reviewer board members. The Reviewer / Editorial Board Members of our Journal-RALF are therefore expected to follow and maintain the basic rules of science while reviewing any sort of manuscript.

To meet the dead-line of the publication the reviewers are expected to review the article within two weeks’ time, as speedy processing is our commitment. Therefore, Reviewers are expected to select potential articles which do not demand repeated reviews.

Criteria for Reviewing:

Reviewers could judge any manuscript on the basis of following criteria:

- Format of the Article: Any major divergence from the standard manuscript format should be indicated.
- Technical Presentation: The research article should be technically presented instead of being presented as a story.
- Novelty: The work should have at least some degree of novelty. Mere repetition of past work should not be accepted. You can look for conceptual advancement over previously published work. Any major omission of the previously published findings on the similar problem must be checked.
- Repeatable Work: Repeatability of the work is the basic principle of science. Kindly check whether the presented work could be repeatable.
Criteria for Reviewing (contd.):

- Interpretation of Result: The discussion should hover around the result and should not include irrelevant and unachievable statement.
- Statistical Presentation: Proper statistics should be applied over the data wherever found necessary.
- Plagiarism of Data: Data showing any type of suspicion, duplication and manipulation must be brought to the notice of the author(s).
- Reviewer can put the article in any category after evaluation i.e., an article submitted as 'Research Article' can be recommended as 'Review Article / Short Article' after our reviewer's recommendations. No author can recommend or force to Journal management to change the category of the article.
- Summary: Pin point the strength and weakness of the article considering potential importance of the work in the context of present and future.
- Conclusion: At the end reviewer(s) can recommend necessary corrections needed to accept the paper, if they are actually required, else recommend it for publication. If found unsuitable the paper should be declared as unacceptable for publication.
Note:

- Complete manuscript must be reviewed in any case, until and unless the paper appears absolutely fake and there is no chance of its correction.
- Review Track change system can be used for reviewing article and to make comments.
- All the suggestions for corrections (by the reviewer or Editorial board members) in the manuscript must be given within brackets using red colored fonts.
- Portion of text requiring corrections should be **underlined and made bold**. Reviewers are requested to avoid any personalized remarks which may hurt the sentiments of author(s) or may be viewed as biased.
- Authors are further recommended to go through our publication policy and ethics before submitting their manuscripts.

**Note:** The Instruction for Reviewers may varies or modified from time to time by Journal management.

---------

We thank Reviewer’s for prompt reviewing the manuscript and visiting the Article Reviewer’s instruction.