

# **Peer Review Policy for the *International Journal of Engineering Research & Science (IJOER)***

The practice of peer review is to ensure that only good science is published. It is an objective process at the heart of good scholarly publishing and is carried out by all reputable scientific journals. Our reviewers therefore play a vital role in maintaining the high standards of the *IJOER* and all manuscripts are peer reviewed following the procedure outlined below.

## **Initial manuscript evaluation**

The Editors first evaluate all manuscripts and check the plagiarism for the original contents. In some circumstances it is entirely feasible for an exceptional manuscript to be accepted at this stage. Those rejected at this stage are insufficiently original, have serious scientific flaws, have poor grammar or English language, or are outside the aims and scope of the journal. Those that meet the minimum criteria are passed on to experts for review.

Authors of manuscripts rejected at this stage will be informed within 1 weeks of receipt.

## **Type of Peer Review**

The *IJOER* employs single blind review, where the reviewer remains anonymous to the authors throughout the process.

## **How the reviewer is selected**

Reviewers are matched to the paper according to their expertise. Our reviewer database contains reviewer contact details together with their subject areas of interest, and this is constantly being updated.

## **Reviewer reports**

Reviewers are asked to evaluate whether the manuscript (<http://ijoer.com/downloads.php>):

- Is original
- Is methodologically sound
- Follows appropriate ethical guidelines
- Has results which are clearly presented and support the conclusions
- Correctly references previous relevant work

After getting the Review Report Authors are getting the Letter of Acceptance to submit the copyright form and Registration form.

Reviewers are not expected to correct or copyedit manuscripts. Language correction is not part of the peer review process. Reviewers are requested to refrain from giving their personal opinion in the “Reviewer blind comments to Author” section of their review on

whether or not the paper should be published. Personal opinions can be expressed in the “Reviewer confidential comments to Editor” section.

How long does the peer review process take?

Typically the manuscript will be reviewed within 1 week. Should the reviewers’ reports contradict one another or a report is unnecessarily delayed a further expert opinion will be sought. Revised manuscripts are usually returned to the Editors within 2 weeks and the Editors may request further advice from the reviewers at this time. The Editors may request more than one revision of a manuscript.

### **Final report**

A final decision to accept or reject the manuscript will be sent to the author along with any recommendations made by the reviewers, and may include verbatim comments by the reviewers.

### **Editor’s Decision is final**

Reviewers advise the Editors, who are responsible for the final decision to accept or reject the article.

### **Special Issues / Conference Proceedings**

Special issues and/or conference proceedings may have different peer review procedures involving, for example, Guest Editors, conference organisers or scientific committees. Authors contributing to these projects may receive full details of the peer review process on request from the editorial office.

### **Becoming a Reviewer for the *IJOER***

If you are not currently a reviewer for the *IJOER* but would like to be considered as a reviewer for this Journal, please contact the editorial office by e-mail at [info.ijoer@gmail.com](mailto:info.ijoer@gmail.com) or [info@ijoer.com](mailto:info@ijoer.com), and provide your contact details. If your request is approved and you are added to the online reviewer database you will receive a confirmatory email, asking you to add details on your field of expertise, in the format of subject classifications and you will be asked to send a signed membership form which is a declaration to accept the policies of the Journal.