



1. Instructions to Reviewers and Review Criteria

1.1. Instructions to reviewers

The selected reviewers shall:

- Remember that all materials submitted for consideration to the Journal are confidential, and should not be distributed, shared, used or otherwise supplied to third parties prior to publication.
- Be requested not to identify themselves to authors.
- Tell the editors if there is any conflict of interest in reviewing of the paper.
- Confidential comments to the editor are welcomed, but it is helpful if the main points are stated in the comments for transmission to the authors. On rare occasions, the board may edit a report to remove offensive language or comments. Editors ask reviewers to avoid statements that may cause needless offence; conversely, reviewers are strongly encouraged to state plainly their opinion of the manuscript. Authors should recognize that criticisms are not necessarily unfair simply because they are expressed in robust language.
- Shall review a manuscript within 15 days.
- Respond within the allotted time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

1.2. Review criteria

Reviewer's comments shall be based on the review criteria of the journal. The reviewer shall provide her/his comments in two ways: describing his/her evaluation in words and rating the quality of the manuscript based on a standard criterion. The criteria for reviewing manuscripts will generally include:

- (a) Originality of the work
- (b) Appropriateness of the manuscript to the Journal
- (c) Analytical rigor, clarity of language and presentation

However, the following specific manuscript review criteria will be used to review the manuscripts to be published in the journal.

The reviewer shall consider the following points for his/her critical evaluation and reflection:

- Strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript



- Organization of abstract
- Clarity and articulation of problem statement, conceptual framework and research questions/objectives
- Comprehensiveness, relevance and critical appraisal of literature review
- Relevance of the study: whether the study addresses important problems/whether the study is worth doing
- Appropriateness of the research design for the research purpose
- Quality of instrumentation and data collection and quality control
- Appropriateness of data analysis procedures and its conformity with research design
- Alignment of results with research methods and research questions, and sufficiency, balance, accuracy of inferences
- Presentation and documentation: language quality, flow, organization of manuscript, issue of plagiarism*

**Plagiarism is when an author attempts to pass off someone else's work as his or her own. Duplicate publication, sometimes called self-plagiarism, occurs when an author reuses substantial parts of his or her published work without providing the appropriate references. Such manuscripts would not be considered for publication. If a case of plagiarism comes to light after a paper is published in JSID, the editorial board will conduct a preliminary investigation. If plagiarism is found, the board will contact the author's institute and funding agencies. A determination of misconduct will lead the board to run a statement to note the plagiarism and to provide a referee to the plagiarized material.*



Where an article, for example, is found to have plagiarized other work or included third-party copyright material without permission or with insufficient acknowledgment, or where the authorship of the article is contested, we reserve the right to take action including, but not limited to: publishing an erratum or corrigendum (correction); retracting the article; taking up the matter with the head of department or dean of the author's institution and/or relevant academic bodies or societies; or taking appropriate legal action.

1.3. Reviewer's recommendation about the manuscript

Reviewer's recommendation shall be one of the following:

- Accept as it is
- Requires minor revisions
- Requires major revisions
- Not suitable for further processing (specify the reason)

2. Communication of Reviewers and Editors Decisions to Authors

- (a) The status of the article, accepted or rejected, will be communicated to the author(s) as specified by reviewers and editors and approved by the office of the editor-in-chief.
- (b) Rejected articles will be returned immediately to the author(s) with comments from the reviewers and editors as to why they have been rejected.