

# Editorial Guidelines

<b><i>Overview</i></b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
<b><i>Editorial Policy</i></b>	<b><i>2</i></b>
<b><i>Yardsticks</i></b>	<b><i>3</i></b>

## **OVERVIEW**

This is a privileged area for the editors of Journals Pub. Editors log in and get full control over the selection and review process.

Editor's management module facilitates management of manuscripts, from their section of unassigned, selection for review, detailed review (Editing), assigning them to referees/seeking their comments, providing comments, to the final decision-making on acceptance, revision, and rejection.

Editors may share their views with the referees and the Journals Pub' publication management team.

Journals Pub' Editorial Board comprises experts/professionals who, on a formal invitation from STM Journals have kindly consented to represent the Journals Pub for providing their valued editing/review services, and guide/support the publication management team of the Journals Pub.

## EDITORIAL POLICY

The manuscript is a privileged document. It needs to be protected from any form of exploitation. Editors/reviewers are expected not to cite, refer to, and refrain from using the information it embodies for the advancement of their own research.

- An editor/reviewer should consciously adopt a positive, impartial attitude towards the manuscript under review.
- An editor/reviewer should aim at promoting precise and effective scientific communication.
- An editor/reviewer who thinks that he/she is not in a position to judge a particular manuscript impartially, should not select or accept it for review/refereeing.
- Review/refereeing should be carried out as per the stipulated timelines. In case, it appears the deadlines are hard to meet in some specific cases, Journals Pub' publication management team should be informed accordingly. This will enable the latter to take alternative measures to avoid expected delays.
- An editor/reviewer should not discuss a manuscript with its author/s. STM Journals' Online Journal System updates authors about every action being taken on their manuscripts.
- The identity of editors/reviewers is kept confidential as per the policies of the Journals Pub.
- It is appropriate, not to make any statement about acceptance/rejection or revision (subject to receipt of two similar opinions on revision) on a manuscript to the author, till a final verdict is arrived at, as per the Journals Pub' norms.
- The announcement of the decision on acceptance/rejection may rest on the Journals Pub' publication management team.
- Journals Pub' publication management team expects the editor/reviewer to monitor the status of manuscripts and especially watch for the comments on revision, rejection, and acceptance to avoid any duplication of efforts at their ends. Onward actions/decisions by the publication management team will be based on the information/comments made available by the editor/reviewer online on the web/offline through an email.
- Critical appraisal should be presented dispassionately in the comments intended for the authors and harsh remarks avoided.
- Suggested modifications should not imply as conditions of acceptance. It is important to make a distinction between revisions considered essential and those judged merely desirable.

- In cases, we do not accept a manuscript; we should convey our constructive comments that might help the author to improve it. This requires providing elaborated comments (with citations, if possible); it will help the editors/reviewers to make a decision on the manuscript and the authors to improve it.
- The documentation on criticism, arguments, and suggestions concerning the manuscript is to be preserved carefully. It will be quite useful for decision-makers.
- Editors/reviewers are not expected to correct mistake/s in grammar but any assistance in this regard will be highly appreciated.
- The editors/publication management team gratefully receives a reviewer's/referee's recommendation (s), but since the decisions are based on evaluations derived from several sources, a reviewer/referee should not expect decision-makers to honor his or her every recommendation.
- (In preparation of these norms, support from the information provided in the guidelines of Council of Science Editors has been taken)

## **YARDSTICKS**

### **General Yardsticks on Suitability of Manuscripts**

- **Originality:** Novel that has the potential to significantly add/support the research already published/known to us through available literature.
- Subject relevance and scientific reliability.
- Importance in terms of application or otherwise to scientific/business community in particular and the society in general of the subject dealt.
- Adequacy of abstract, keywords.
- Appropriateness of approach or experimental design, adequacy of experimental techniques (including statistics where appropriate, need for statistical assessment). Methods adequately described/appropriate, or not.
- Results relevant to the problem posed/credible, or not.
- Answers to questions: Soundness of conclusions and interpretation, interpretation and conclusions warranted by the data, reasonable speculation, and clarity of the message.
- Relevance of citations and their up-to-date inclusion. Obvious omission(s) if any.

- Relevance of the figures and tables, clarity of legends and titles.
- Suitability for the STM Journals in totality. Its appropriateness for general readers or for a specialist clientele.
- Presentation in toto, considering writing style, clarity in expression.

(In preparation of these norms, support from the information provided in the guidelines of Council of Science Editors has been taken)