

The Lawrantians Publication

The Peer Review Process

The Peer Review Process:

Submission:

Once the manuscript is submitted to the Lawrantians Publication, the following stages of review will be followed to ensure the quality and standards of publication:

Initial manuscript evaluation:

1. All submissions, will be first checked for plagiarism using standard software. If an article is found to have high level of similarity or plagiarised work of others without due or insufficient acknowledgements, the editors reserve the right to retract the article or may resend the articles to the authors for resubmitting the same with due corrections.
2. All new submissions will be then screened for adherence to the Journal's policy and guidelines.
3. The authors whose manuscript are rejected at the initial evaluation stage will be informed within three to four weeks of the submission.
4. The authors whose manuscripts have passed the initial stage will be assigned to senior editors for further consideration.

Editor evaluation:

The Senior Editors will evaluate the manuscript for its originality, conceptual and methodological consistency, grammar and language as well as decide whether the submissions are within the aims and scope of the journal. The Editors reserve the right to decide whether the submission requires further review or not.

Peer Review:

Once the submissions are shortlisted by the Editors they will be sent for peer review. The peer review process being anonymous (Blind), the name of the author shall be concealed. Each manuscript shall be reviewed by two referees, invited by the Editorial board based on the expertise on the subject /area of the submission.

Peer Review Guidelines:

The Reviewer shall evaluate the manuscript and submit report on the basis of –

- Originality and significance of the contribution
- Coverage and adequacy of appropriate and existing literature
- Relevance to the subject area as well as its national and international relevance
- Clarity, consistency, style of writing
- Structure, organisation, analysis and interpretation

Timeline:

The Reviewer shall be given sufficient time (at least 60 days) to review the submission and submit suggestions, recommend changes as well as decide on the merit of the submission. In the event of a change in circumstance prior to the completion of the review, or if an extension is necessary, the same is required to be communicated to the journal at the earliest.

Non-disclosure of content:

In the good faith of respecting the confidentiality of the peer review process, the peer reviewers are required to refrain from using the information acquired for their own or another's advantage.

Confidentiality:

Name, background and other details of the reviewer and the author are not to be disclosed in any circumstance by either of the parties.

Bias and competing interests:

The reviewers are expected to remain unbiased regarding nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or any other such characteristics of the origins or contents of the manuscript or by any commercial aspects.

Non-transferability of peer review:

Any peer review conducted for this journal remains non-transferable to other journals or publications.

Assessment Criteria:

The assessment criteria shall be based on, including but not limited to, the following (The Reviewer will evaluate the submitted article according to the following criteria and in the format provided):

1. Do you recommend/accept this manuscript for publication? If yes, should the acceptance be with no changes or minor or major revisions?
2. How original is the research idea? Does the research add to the already existing literature in the subject area?
3. Is the language of the manuscript lucid and easy to read?
4. Is the manuscript of appropriate length?
5. Does the title and introduction provide a clear overview and introduce the topic accordingly?
6. Does the conclusion aptly answer the research question posed in the manuscript?
7. Does the article include any empirical research and has the author(s) used viable research methodology/ies to arrive at conclusions vis à vis data collected? Whether the conclusion derived from these statistics appears to be relevant to the research conducted?
8. Is the manuscript supported by reliable sources?

9. Does the article fit into the editorial aims and scope of the journal?

10. Other comments

11. Constructive suggestions: What changes or revisions should be made by the author to make the manuscript publishable?

The reports:

The reviewer/s report as received will be sent to the author after concealing the name of the reviewers. In case the authors wish to comment/respond on the comments of the reviewer/s it shall be made available to the reviewers after concealing the name of the contributor. The standard policy practice is for both identities to remain concealed.

The final decision and time to publication:

On the receipt of the reviewer's comments/suggestions or decision the Editor will be responsible for the final decision to reject or recommend the manuscript for publication. In case the manuscript requires changes and depending on the changes required the author shall be given 30 days to resubmit the manuscript after incorporating the changes suggested by the reviewer.

On receipt of the revised manuscript the Editors will check on whether the author has adhered to or incorporated all the changes suggested. The Editors reserve the right to resend the accepted paper for further review to the same reviewer or to any other person it deems fit. After acceptance, it takes 3 to 4 weeks to get the final corrected draft of the set of accepted compiled manuscripts of a particular volume to be sent to the publisher for typesetting. Following the receipt of the typeset draft, the Editors will once again proof read the content for any errors. This process usually takes 1 to 2 weeks. The complete set of manuscripts compiled into a volume will be sent for final printing.

EDITORS

THE LAWRENTIANS PUBLICATION