# Reviewer's Guidelines

**About the Reviewers**

Our reviewers of 8M Journal are experts of their respective areas. They are highly qualified, experienced and maintain reliability, validity, essence and quality of research contribution of authors through effective blind peer-review process. Our blind peer-review policy has been framed on effective peer review processes not only to uphold the essence and validity of manuscripts, but also the overall integrity of the 8M Journal. The blind peer-review process comprises of sending requests to the esteemed scholarly reviewers with an in-depth knowledge of the specialized discipline to review the manuscripts. The reviewer panel includes experts, those who have common areas of interest, expertise and experience to evaluate the work to be published. The whole process depends on the trust and involvement of the participating reviewers. We appreciate the contribution of reviewers in terms of their valuable comments and suggestions adding value to the research papers.

The reviewers are given full autonomy to reflect and to appraise and provide significant criticism with the intention that the researcher can revise and incorporate the suggested changes to enhance their research contribution to the respective stakeholders in the field of research and innovation.

**Selection of Reviewers**

The reviewers have been selected to achieve the objective of improving the manuscripts by providing a deeper insight into the research topics and content. The reviewers' domain knowledge make the author aware about the shortcomings in the research and provide clarifications about the subject.

Ethical issues are taken care of by the editorial team before sending the manuscript to the panel of reviewers.

**Check List for the Reviewers**

Reviewer(s) take care to review the manuscripts through the following parameters:

1. All key parameters been covered in the manuscript: Abstract, Introduction, Literature Review, research methodology, results and discussion, conclusion and research implications and future scope.
2. **Title of the Manuscript**: Whether the title describes the content of the research and whether it has been phrased laconically.
3. **Originality:** Is the paper according to the reviewer, original? Does it provide some new information to justify that it is of standard publishable quality.
4. **Review of Literature:** Has the author of the paper provided explanation of work conducted in the relevant research area? Have gaps in literature been identified? Has the author explained the reason why he/she have undertaken the present research?
5. **Research Methodology**: The author should clearly explain the design and methodology that the author has used in the paper. In case of primary research, what are the objectives that the author plans to satisfy through the research. If secondary sources are used, have they been designed properly? Hypothesis to be tested should be defined.
6. **Results and Discussion**: The reviewer ensures that the results and discussion are based on the objectives of the research undertaken. The reviewer has to ensure that the results are associated to expectations, hypothesis framed and to what extent it varies from prior research.
7. **Conclusion:** The conclusion has been drawn from the objectives, results and discussion and carries logical and rationale thinking.
8. **Implications for Future Research**: Suggestions for future research are to be identified. Further, what is the contribution to knowledge and the scope for future research should be provided.
9. **Quality of Communication**: The reviewers ensure that the communication is clear and expression is readable and the sentence structure is grammatically correct.

10. **Accept/Reject/Minor Revision/Major Revision** is clearly provided by the reviewer with the reasons. In case of revision the parameters and sections are clearly mentioned.
11. A manuscripts revision format is sent to the author with reviewer's comments.

**Reviewers' Final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of the manuscript should be in one of the three categories:**

- Rejected due to poor quality, or out of scope;
- Accept without revision;
- Accept but needs revision (either major or minor).

In case of, "Accept but needs revision category", reviewers need to clearly identify and highlight what revision is required, to the editor and as well as provide their acceptance for further reviewing the same manuscript. .