Queens' Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development

Manuscript Review Guideline

Description
Research Audience
Editorial Board
Review Checklist
Review Criteria
Elements of Review Report
Overall Munscript Evaluation Form
Reviwer's recommendation

Description

Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development is a multidisciplinary international journal for all those concerned with equity in sciences and sustainable development. The journal's contents reveal its integrative approach including original research articles, discussion of research notes, short communications, and critical book/article reviews. Manuscripts to be submitted in the journal are critically relevant to the advancement of theories, and body of knowledge/literature. The

decision for the submission including accepting, rejecting, or revision is the results of double anonymized reviews by at least two expert referees.

Audience

Academics and researchers, and policymakers.

Editorial Board Members

Editor-in-Chief

Sintayehu Aynalem, PhD in Management: Madda Walabu University

Associate Editor

Bereket Solomon, PhD in Public Management, Ethiopian Civil Service University

Technical Editors:

- Hussien Jerso, PhD
- Zemenu Bires, PhD in Business Management
- Tsegaye Agede, PhD Candidate
- Kibert Baye, PhD in Accounting and Finance
- Mohammed Hussien, PhD Candidate

Language and Copy Editors

- Mr. Aklil Seyoum
- Mr. Bruik G/Tsadik

Advisory Board Members

- Yonas Belay, PhD in Microbiology
- Mrs. Seble Miruts, CEO of Queens College
- Mr. Tadesse Legesse, Preisdant of Queens College
- Mr. Yonas Chanie, Acdamaic V/president, Queens College
- Ashebir Tekele, PhD Candidate, Vice president, Queens College

Reviewer's checklists

Before you accept or decline an invitation to review, consider the following several questions to be considered:

- **Are you qualified**? Or does the manuscript really match your area of expertise? Only accept if you feel that you can provide a high-quality review report.
- **Are there any potential conflict of interest**? If there is, please disclose this to the editor when you respond. Potential conflicts of interest may include if you have a strong relationship (both positive and negative feelings) about one of the authors or if you have published papers or co-authored with one of the co-authors, and other relationships.
- **Do you have time to review**? Before you accept the review, first make sure you can meet the deadline. Sending in a review long after the deadline will delay the publication process and frustrate the editor and authors.

Once you accept to review, you should know that your review report strongly helps to editors' to check the submission's suitability for publication based on the review criteria provided that editors able to assess the papers' exclusively against the journal's criteria for publication. In particular, the review result will help the editor to decide whether or not to publish the manuscript. It will also help the author and allow them to improve their manuscript. Review suggestions/feedback need to be courteous, specific, constructive, and enlightening to guide the author/s on how they can improve the manuscript to be acceptable for publication. Therefore, it has to be understand that you should not indicate any ad hominem annotations or any personal details including your name unless you are invited by the journal to do so.

Therefore, the manuscript to be published in *Queens' Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development* must satisfy all of the following criteria:

- The manuscript is in line with the journal's scope and guideline
- The manuscript can pose a clear and novel research question.
- Be academically acceptable in research approach and methods.
- The manuscript provides appropriate evidence or reasonable extensions of the results to draw conclusions and possible implications.

- The manuscript make a contribution to extension or advancement of literature.
- The manuscript should be presented in an intelligible fashion and using Standard English.

Elements that a reviewer's report should include:

The review report should consider the following aspects of the manuscript:

Key arguments or results

Giving your overall opinion and general observations of the article is essential, especially providing evidence of any deficiencies of the manuscript is important. Reviewer can provide an overview of the key messages of the paper by highlighting what finds interesting or notable from the manuscript. You are encouraging to provide detail explanation and support your arguments so that your review is sound to both editors and authors that are able to fully understand the intellectual behind your comments. It is also critically important to indicate whether your comments are your own intuition or are reflection based on the manuscripts' data and evidence.

Validity

The reviewer's evaluation of the soundness and robustness of the research question and conclusions. It need to examine what research questions do the authors address in the manuscript, e.g., are clearly stated? Especially, if there are errors (whether logical, analytical, ethical or other) that prohibit the manuscript's publication, the reviewers can describe in detail.

Data and/or methodology

The methods that authors have employed to address the research question are one of the most important elements used to judge the overall scientific quality/soundness of the research paper. The assessment of the validity of the approach, the quality of the data, and the quality of presentation is part of the review report. Especially, it is important to clearly identify the strengths and weaknesses of the method described in the manuscript. Reviewers are asked to assess all the data including in the analysis and provided as a supplementary information. It is satisfied that the methodology is sufficiently robust, further it also needs to examine any data in the form of figures, tables, or images. It is noted that reviewers need to look for potential sources of bias in the methods

that the study was designed and carried out. Authors may asked to attach supplementary data and information along with their submission to enable research audiences to intermingle and engross more thoroughly with their research after publication. Therefore, please be aware that links to data might therefore be present along with the main submission files. These items therefore should also receive the attention of reviewers during the peer-review process. Manuscripts may also contain database identifiers or accession numbers, e.g., DOI; however, if any aspect of the data is outside the scope of the reviewer's expertise, it should be genuinely noted in the review report or in the comments to the editor.

Analytical approach

The assessment of the strength of the analytical approach, e.g., the validity and robustness of any statistical tests, appropriate statistical tools employed, or logical coherence of any arguments developed is critical element in the peer-review process. Therefore, it is important that peer-reviewers have a solid understanding of statistics, and to carefully examine the statistical tools and how statistical results are reporting in the manuscript text. However, if any aspect of the analytical approach is outside the scope of reviewers' expertise, it should be carefully noted in the review report or in the comments to the editor.

Contribution of the Manuscript

Please state whether the manuscript makes a contribution to the body of knowledge/literature. One of the most important criteria that ***Queens' Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development*** requires is that a manuscript should report something new, specific, and not simply recurrence what is already known in the literature. Especially if the manuscript simply brings what is already known, please provide evidence. Therefore, the reviewer should carefully assess the originality (or contribution, addition of knowledge to scientific literature or in the field of the manuscript). If the submission is review, it is also important to evaluate the importance of the topic/scope of the review, originality of the review, timeliness, the breadth and accuracy of the discussion, indicates the best avenues for future research, and comment whether the author presents the most relevant recent advances in the field and it is critical to see the references are pertinent to the topic and cover both theoretical literature and more recent empirical evidences

along with presentation of results, discussion, and possible implications/lessons inferred from the review article.

Suggested improvement

Encouraging suggestions for the improvement of the manuscript, e.g., including experiments, data, additional discussion, and standards of English usage that could help strengthen the manuscript and make it suitable for publication in the journal. However, comments should be limited to the scope of the manuscript; that is, they should only include what can be reasonably addressed in a revision and evade giving suggestions that would significantly change the scope of the manuscript. The Editor will assess all the suggestions given by the reviewers and provide additional guidance to the authors. The reviewers provide an opportunity to provide comments to author and confidential comments to the editor.

Ethical guidelines

The reviewer should keep the manuscript and your review as confidential and must not share your review results or information related to the overall review process with third party even after publication without the permission of the concerned editors and authors involved in the manuscript. If you suspect plagiarism, academic fraud or have other ethical concerns, please communicate your suspicions with only the editor, and try to provide evidence as much detail as possible. It is also important to know that recommendation to cite your authored or co-authored works must only for genuine scientific reasons and not with the purpose of increasing your citation counts or increasing the visibility of your work. It should be know that the reviewer should not use any information obtained from the manuscript for his/her own or for other person's or organization's privilege or to credit others. The reviewer should not be influenced by the origins of a manuscript and should also respect other reviewers' views during the manuscript review process.

Overall review evaluation format

Check in the boxes which, in your opinion, best describe the manuscript.

Review criteria	**Poor (1)**	**Marginal (2)**	**Acceptable (3)**	**Good(4)**	**Excellent(5)**

Formulation of the problem / Clarity of objectives	○	○	○	◉	○
Quality of literature review	○	○	○	○	○
Robustness of research methodology (sampling, data quality, and tools employed)	○	○	○	○	○
Data analysis (scientific procedures and appropriate statistical tools employed)	○	○	○	○	○
Significance of findings or discussion	○	○	○	○	○
Clarity of recommendations or implications	○	○	○	○	○
Conclusion (extension of results)	○	○	○	○	○
Contribution to knowledge, literature and/or practice	○	○	○	○	○
Standard use of language, e.g., grammar, spelling, readability, clarity…)	○	○	○	○	○
Appropriate referencing and citation	○	○	○	○	○

Reviewer's recommendation	
Reject (explain your reasoning in the report)	◉
Revise (either major or minor *revision*)	○
Accept (*manuscript can be accepted without revision*)	○

Reviewers' Recognition

As a token of appreciation, we would like to provide you a review recognition certificate from the Editorial Office.