

FOR REVIEWERS

This document provides guidelines for JICM reviewers (Original text from JScholar, [open access](#)). JICM follows peer review publication that maintains high standardized review process of the articles that it receives. JICM depends on reviews by knowledgeable and research experts in order to maintain the accuracy and high quality of its content.

Dear Reviewer,

Below, you will find a series of statements with which you may agree or disagree. If you are NOT agree with statements bellow, please explain the reasons in “comments” section when sending your decision at JICM’s Reviewer Page (<http://www.ejmanager.com/reviewers/index.php?isl=login>).

Language of the Manuscript

- ✓ Proper, no need to language editing (you don't have to correct the English, You should bring this to the attention of the editor: English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and etc.).

Article Title

- ✓ The title of article is consistent with the problem that presented in the study.
- ✓ The title of the article generally reflects the main message of the study.

Abstract

- ✓ The abstract is presented in structured form (i.e. Abstract is including Objectives, Materials and methods, Results, Conclusion subheadings)
- ✓ The abstract gives an adequate picture of the entire study.

Introduction

- ✓ The background (Introduction) of the study is clear and helpful to readers unfamiliar to the subject.
- ✓ The objectives/aims of the study are clearly stated.

Materials and Methods

- ✓ The study design is appropriate and the methods clearly explained.
- ✓ The criteria for selecting the sample of cases are clearly explained and justified.
- ✓ The essential characteristics of the cases are sufficiently described.
- ✓ The sample size is adequate and representative.
- ✓ The data been have collected in a systematic and comprehensive manner.
- ✓ The statistical methods are appropriate.
- ✓ There are no ethical concerns about this study.

Results

- ✓ The numerical values related to demographical, clinical and laboratory values of study and control groups are given systematically.
- ✓ The analyses of the data have been in a systematic manner and appropriate.
- ✓ The results are persuasive.
- ✓ The results are important or have scientific value.

Discussion

- ✓ The interpretation/comments (discussion) of the results are clearly presented and adequately supported by the evidence found in the literature.
- ✓ Each data presented in “results section” is discussed respectively with the previous literature findings.

Conclusion

- ✓ The conclusions are logically valid and justified by the evidence obtained from this study.
- ✓ Graphics and figures
- ✓ All of the figures (high resolution) and tables are adequate and necessary.

References

- ✓ The references are up-to-date?
- ✓ The most important previous studies have been cited.

Overall Assessment

- ✓ The subject of the study is important.
- ✓ The manuscript has a scientific/practical/educational value.

MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE SUBMITTED ARTICLE/PAPER

Being a reviewer of JICM, you need to take the responsibility of maintaining confidentiality of ideas that have been presented in the papers which you review. Focus your evaluation on merits and demerits of the paper and physiological significance of the findings in your confidential remarks to the Editor. Never reveal the assigned paper's results or videos/images or any of the supplementary material to non-reviewers.

BE ANONYMOUS

The identity of the reviewers should never be revealed out to the authors at any time either during the process of review or after its publication.

REVIEW DIRECTING

Reviewing needs to be conducted confidentially, the article you have been asked to review may as well not be uncovered to a third gathering. In you wish to inspire a notion from partners or people noticing the article you may as well let the editor know beforehand. Most editors welcome supplemental remarks, yet whoever else is included will likewise need to keep the review process confidential. In spite of the fact that journal practices change, most journal do not share the identity of the reviewer with the author. To help us secure your identity, please don't disclose your name inside the content of your review.

You should not attempt to contact the author.

Be mindful when you submit your review that any suggestions you make will contribute to the last choice made by the editor.

Relying on the journal, you can be asked to assess the article on various criteria. Certain journal provides detailed guidance others don't, however ordinarily you might be wanting to assess the article as per the taking over.

Originality: Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Does it augment the ordinance of information? Does the article stick to the journal's standards? Is the research an important one? To verify its creativity and propriety for the journal, it may be accommodating to think about the exploration regarding what percentile it is in? Is it accurate to say that it is in the top 25% of papers in this field? You may wish to do a quick literary works seek utilizing devices for example Scopus to see if there are any reviews of the area. Depending on if the research has been secured a while ago, pass on references of those works to the editor.

Structure Is the article decidedly laid out? It is safe to say that all are the key elements present: abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions? Think about every component in turn.

Title: Does it clearly describe the article?

Abstract: Does it reflect the content of the article?

Where graphical abstracts works or alternately highlights are incorporated, please check the content and if conceivable make prescriptions for enhancements.

Introduction: Does it describe what the author had a specific end goal, which was to realize precisely, and obviously state the situation being explored? Normally, the introduction may as well compress relevant research to provide context, and illustrate what different authors findings, if any, are being challenged or amplified. It might as well describe the experiment, the hypothesis(es) and the general experimental design or technique.

Method: Does the author precisely explain how the information was gathered? Is the outline suitable for addressing the question posed? Is there sufficient qualified data display for you to replicate the research? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these ordered in a meaningful way? Provided that the methods are new, is it true that they are illustrated in detail? Have the equipment and materials been adequately described? Does the article make it clear what sort of information was recorded. Has the writer been precise in describing measurements?

Results: This is where the author(s) might as well illustrate in expressions what he/she/they revealed in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. You will recognize if the suitable analysis has been done. Are the statistics right? In the event that you are not agreeable with statistics, please prompt the editor when you submit your report. Understanding of outcomes may as well not be incorporated in this section.

Conclusion/Discussion: Are the cases in this segment backed by the outcomes, do they appear sensible? Have the authors has shown how the results identify with wants and to earlier research? Does the conclusion clearly explains how the research showed it impact in moving the scientific knowledge forward?

Language: Provided that an article is inadequately composed because of grammatical errors, while it might make it more challenging to grasp the science, you don't have to correct the English. You should bring this to the attention of the editor, however. At last, when considering the entire article, do the figures and tables advise the reader, are they a vital part of the story? Do the figures depict the information correctly?

Earlier Research: Provided that the article expands past research does it refer that work suitably? Are there any significant works that have been violated? Are the references correct?

ETHICAL ISSUES:

- The reviewer should give an honest and exact analysis of the research. The main role of the reviewers is to analyze the merits and the demerits and to provide necessary suggestions in order to increase the quality of the work.
- The reviewer of paper should not review the manuscript that is co-authored by himself, or a member of his/her institution or to someone to whom he is related.
- After receiving the paper for any further assistance or clarifications you need to contact only the editor and the confidentiality of the paper has to be maintained. You must never ask anyone to review a portion of paper without editor's permission and also must never contact the author of the paper directly.
- If the conduct of the reviewer seems to be mischievous then the manuscript will be assigned to second reviewer.
- The reviewer should accept the manuscripts which fall into his/her area of expertise. Anyhow the editors will assign it to concerned reviewers yet sometimes a mistake may happen. This is because in order to maintain high standards of the review process.
- The reviewer can also inform the editor regarding suspected duplicate publication, plagiarism, or any ethical concerns about the use of animals or humans in the research that has been done by author.

The reviewer report should come under any of the following:

- Accept
- Minor revision
- Major revision
- Reject

Additional reviewer resources:

- <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/review/peer.asp>
- <http://mchelp.manuscriptcentral.com/gethelpnow/guides.htm>

We are always very grateful for the contribution made to our journals by our referees and would be pleased to hear any comments or suggestions on our current peer-review procedures.