

## Peer-review policy

### General information

**NEW MAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES (NMIJMS)** is an international journal published monthly by New Man Publication. The mission of NMIJMS is to promote an academic discussion on scholarly works and research. The journal has been published in English, Hindi and Marathi. It invites original research papers, articles, case studies, poems, short stories, socio-political writings and reviews in the fields of Literature, Languages, Linguistics, and other disciplines of Humanities, Social Sciences, Education and related areas. Contributions submitted to the journal will be double-blind peer reviewed by members of the editorial board. Please go through the guidelines before submitting your contributions. For any query simply email us at: [nmpublication@gmail.com](mailto:nmpublication@gmail.com)

For any general questions and comments about the peer-review process, the journal or its editorial policies that are not addressed here, we encourage reviewers to contact us .

Questions about a specific manuscript should be directed to the editor who is handling the manuscript.

### Online manuscript review

We ask peer-reviewers to submit their reports via our secure online system by following the link provided in the editor's email.

### Criteria for publication

NMIJMS receive many more submissions than they can publish. Therefore, we ask peer-reviewers to keep in mind that every paper that is accepted means that another good paper must be rejected. To be published in the NMIJMS, a paper should be rich in content and form and that should meet our editorial criteria.

### The review process

Editorial staff of NMIJMS read all submitted manuscripts. Only those papers that seem most likely to meet our editorial criteria are sent for formal review. Those papers judged by the editors to be of insufficient general interest or otherwise inappropriate are rejected promptly without external review. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review, typically to two or three reviewers. The editors then make a decision based on the reviewers' advice, from among several possibilities:

- **Accept**, with or without editorial revisions
- Invite the authors to **revise their manuscript** to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached
- Reject, but indicate to the authors that **further work might justify a resubmission**

### Selecting peer-reviewers

Reviewer selection is critical to the publication process, and we base our choice on many factors, including expertise, reputation, specific recommendations and our own previous experience of a reviewer's characteristics. For instance, we avoid using people who are slow, careless, or do not provide reasoning for their views, whether harsh or lenient.

We check with potential reviewers before sending them manuscripts to review. Reviewers should bear in mind that these messages contain confidential information, which should be treated as such.

### Writing the review

The primary purpose of the review is to provide the editors with the information needed to reach a decision but the review should also instruct the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable. As far as possible, a negative review should explain to the authors the major weaknesses of their manuscript, so that rejected authors can understand the basis for the decision and see in broad terms what needs to be done to improve the manuscript for publication elsewhere. Referees should not feel obliged to provide detailed, constructive advice regarding minor criticisms of the manuscript if it does not meet the criteria for the journal (as outlined in the letter from the editor when asking for the review).

Confidential comments to the editor are welcome, but it is helpful if the main points are stated in the comments for transmission to the authors. The ideal review should answer the following questions:

- Who will be interested in reading the paper, and why?
- What are the main claims of the paper and how significant are they?
- Are there other experiments or work that would strengthen the paper further?
- How much would further work improve it, and how difficult would this be? Would it take a long time?
- Are the claims appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature?
- If the manuscript is unacceptable, is the study sufficiently promising to encourage the authors to resubmit?
- If the manuscript is unacceptable but promising, what specific work is needed to make it acceptable?

### Other questions to consider

We appreciate that reviewers are busy, and we are very grateful if they can answer the questions in the section above. However, if time is available, it is extremely helpful to the editors if reviewers can advise on some of the following points:

- Is the manuscript clearly written?
- If not, how could it be made more clear or accessible to non-specialists?
- Would readers outside the discipline benefit from a schematic of the main result to accompany publication?
- Could the manuscript be shortened?
- Have the authors done themselves justice without overselling their claims?
- Have they been fair in their treatment of previous literature?
- Have they provided sufficient methodological detail that the experiments could be reproduced?
- Is the statistical analysis of the data sound, and does it conform to the journal's guidelines?

### Timing

NMIJMS is committed to rapid editorial decisions and publication, and we believe that an efficient editorial process is a valuable service both to our authors and to the scientific community as a whole. We therefore ask reviewers to respond promptly within the number of days agreed. If reviewers anticipate a longer delay than previously expected, we ask them to let us know so that we can keep the authors informed and, where necessary, find alternatives.

### Anonymity

We do not release referees' identities to authors or to other reviewers unless a referee voluntarily signs their comments to the authors. Our preference is for referees to remain anonymous throughout the review process and beyond. However, to increase the transparency of the reviewing process, reviewers may sign their reports, if they feel comfortable doing so.

### Editing referees' reports

As a matter of policy, we do not suppress reviewers' reports; any comments that were intended for the authors are transmitted, regardless of what we may think of the content. On rare occasions, we may edit a report to remove offensive language or comments that reveal confidential information about other matters. We ask reviewers to avoid statements that may cause needless offence; conversely, we strongly encourage reviewers to state plainly their opinion of a paper. Authors should recognize that criticisms are not necessarily unfair simply because they are expressed in robust language.