



**Government of Tripura**  
**Directorate of Kokborok & Other Minority Languages**  
**Education Department**  
**Shiksha Bhavan, Agartala, West Tripura**

**-: REVIEWERS' GUIDELINE: -**

• **WRITING YOUR REVIEW -**

Once you receive the invitation to review, you will usually need to go through the following steps. This process is intended to describe the general basis for creating an effective review, but it can vary according to the particular requirements of the commissioning editor, or according to your own preferences.

**A. Accepting or rejecting the invitation to review –**

If you receive an invitation to review, you will need to let the journal know if you are able to complete the review within the requested deadline. Consider the following questions when deciding whether to accept the invitation:

i. **Do I have the appropriate expertise to review this article?** - If you are not confident of your ability to assess the article's quality, you should feel free to discuss this with the editor. It may be that you are still able to comment on specific aspects of the article, or that it is better to decline the review this time. This discussion will also help editors to target their review invitations more effectively in the future, especially if you clarify your own areas of expertise, and, where possible, provide alternative suggestions for reviewers.

ii. **Do I have any conflict of interest regarding this article or its author?** - Conflicts of interest include anything that might impede your ability to give an unbiased assessment of the article. By only accepting reviews that you are able to assess fairly, you are preserving the integrity of the peer review process. Do declare any potential conflict to the editor who has invited the review. If you'd like to learn more about conflicts of interest.

iii. **Do I have the time to conduct this review effectively?** - Most review invitations will include a deadline for receipt of the review. If you will be unable to complete the review by this deadline, you should let the Editorial Board know.

If you are not able to accept the invitation to review, it is best to send your response as quickly as possible so that the Editorial Board is able to find alternative reviewers. Where possible, it is also common practice to suggest alternative reviewers if you are not able to review.

**B. Basic Guideline for Reviewing –**

**1. Journal guideline -**

These suggest the key considerations and a recommended structure for your review. If there are guidelines, it is important to read them carefully before you start the process, and adapt your review and your considerations to suit the journal's requirements. If you are unsure as to whether there are any particular requirements, the Editorial Board will be able to let you know.

**2. First reading: Overview of article and contribution -**

On your first reading, you should be aiming to form an overall impression and understanding of the article. You may wish to make some notes on these first impressions, focusing on recent related work in the area, responding to the article's statement of purpose, and thinking about the impact that you feel that the article might have on the general body of research in your discipline.

### 3. **Second reading: Detailed reading -**

Once you have read the article once and formed a broad impression of it, you should undertake a second, more detailed reading of the article, with the aim of giving a rounded and objective evaluation. You may wish to consider the following aspects of the article:

#### i. **The article's contribution to the discipline**

- Does the article make a contribution to the discipline?
- How significant is that contribution?
- Do the authors adequately explain the importance of the article in the discipline?
- Is the article a good fit for the journal in question?

#### ii. **Academic rigour and accuracy**

- Is the methodology or argument used in the article sound?
- Does the article make a reasonable interpretation of the data or sources?
- Is there sufficient evidence to substantiate the article's claims?
- Are the appropriate references cited, and are there any other references that you would recommend as essential to the article?
- Are those references cited assessed fairly by the author?
- Is the information (e.g., data, formulae, quotations, references, tables and figures) in the article accurate, and correct?

#### iii. **Style and structure**

- Is the structure of the article clear and well organised?
- Does the author introduce and contextualise the aims of the article effectively?
- Does the author summarise the conclusions of the article effectively?
- Is the language in the article clear, and correct?
- Does the abstract accurately present the article's aims, argument and conclusions?

Many reviewers find that it is useful to make notes related to each of these areas as they complete the first reading of the article. Using these notes, you can then complete your review by substantiating your evaluation with examples from the article

### C. **Writing your review**

Once you have read the article and made notes on both your broad and detailed impressions, you have the raw material for writing your review. Many reviewers choose to summarise their thoughts in the first paragraphs of the review, and then, in the second half of the review, move onto a more detailed substantiation of their recommendations, with suggestions for revisions where needed. Your review will be guiding the Editorial Board when deciding on one of four routes, listed below:

1. **Accept without revision:** Very rarely, an article will be accepted for publication without any revisions requested.
2. **Minor revisions needed:** The article is mostly sound, but with some small changes required to the argument, interpretation of the results, or references. Minor revisions might include:
  - A small amount of editing to the language, to improve how the article's findings or argument are communicated
  - Small additional experiments to complement the main body of the article
  - Including a small number of new citations or mentioning additional topics
  - Tweaking the interpretation of the results or evidence You should give a detailed assessment of those minor revisions you believe to be essential to the quality of the article.

- Suggestions for other, but non-essential, improvements to the article are also welcomed, but you should clearly differentiate these in your review from those which you consider to be essential. This will allow both editor and author(s) to prioritise your recommendations effectively.
3. **Major revisions needed:** The principle of the article is sound, but it will be necessary for large changes to be made in order to prepare it for publication. Situations in which major revisions may be requested include:
- If the article has major structural issues that need to be rectified by significantly reorganizing the text.
  - If more experiments are needed to support the aims of the article.
  - If the argument needs to take into account a whole new topic.
  - If existing analysis of the data/evidence is flawed and needs to be re-worked.

Your review can help to guide the major revisions needed, so do include suggestions for major revisions if you feel that they are essential for the success of the article. However, do bear in mind the fact that major revisions can cost the author(s) further time and money, so it is important to provide clear reasons for the necessity of further work, and to give an accurate assessment of whether the article will be academically sound should these revisions be made. You should also include your recommendations for minor revisions in your review, even if you are recommending major revisions, so that the author(s) can address all of the issues with the article during the revision stage.

4. **Inappropriate:** If the article is not sound in principle or methodology, or does not make any significant contribution to the field, it may be rejected by the editor. If you believe that there are major problems with the article, it is important to give objective reasons and evidence for this. This will ensure that the editor understands your concerns when they are called upon to make a final decision, and in turn helps the author to develop their future research according to your feedback. Submitting your review Once you are confident that your review accurately reflects your professional opinion of the article, submit it to the Editorial Board by the agreed deadline.

Once submitted, the Editorial Board will read and consider your review, and will make a decision on how to progress with the article. The Editorial Board will collate the reviewer's / reviewers' recommendations and send them to the author. Revisions You may be called upon to review the article again once the author has had chance to make the necessary changes. In this case, it is helpful to compare your initial review against the changed article, to make sure that the changes that you proposed have been made successfully. You may also suggest additional changes, in the manner of a first review. For most articles, there will be one or two revision stages, depending on the number and nature of revisions needed. After you review the final decision will be taken by the Editorial Board, who will collate the final comments on the revisions. If the article is accepted, the final files will be handed over by the author so that the publication process can begin.

**(Sabyasachi Singh)**  
H/O & Dy. Director  
Kokborok & Other Minority Languages  
Govt. of Tripura

\*\*\*\*\*