GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Peer review is the principal mechanism by which the quality of a research is judged and helps to maintain our journal’s high editorial standards. CCS Archive relies heavily on the scientific referees or reviewers who agree to participate in our double-blind peer-review system. CCS Archive carefully selects reviewers for submitted manuscripts from among the top scholars in the field whose expertise most closely matches the manuscript’s topic.

The reviewer’s evaluation plays a major role in our decision as to whether to accept a manuscript for publication. CCS Archive trust the reviewer to be prompt, fair, respectful of the rights of the authors, respectful of our obligations to the readership, and to evaluate the manuscript carefully and in depth.

Peer-reviewer’s Roles

- Provide written, unbiased feedback on the scholarly merits and scientific value of the work, together with rationale for your opinion.
- Provide your review report in a timely manner within a turnaround period of 10 days. We are aware that for some reviewers this 10-day turnaround period may be tight, and reviewers are always welcome to inform the CCS Editorial Office should they need some extra time to complete the review.
- Indicate whether the writing is clear, concise, and relevant and rate the work’s composition, scientific accuracy, originality, and interest to readers.
- Avoid personal comments or criticism.
- Refrain from direct author contact without the editor’s permission.
- Maintain the confidentiality of the review process by not sharing, discussing with third parties, or disclosing information from the reviewed paper without permission from the editorial office.
- Notifying the editor immediately if unable to review in a timely manner and suggesting the names of potential other reviewers.
- Determining scientific merit, originality, and scope of the work; indicating ways to improve it; and recommending acceptance or rejection using whatever rating scale the editor deems most useful.
- Alerting the editor about any potential personal or financial conflict of interest and declining to review when a possibility of a conflict exists.
• Noting any ethical concerns, such as substantial similarity between the reviewed manuscript and any published paper or any manuscript concurrently submitted to another journal which may be known to the reviewer.

• Ensuring that the article cites all relevant work by other scientists

**Ethical Responsibilities**

**Confidentiality**
The manuscript submitted for peer-review is a privileged communication. Reviewers should refrain from sharing it to anyone or discuss it, except to solicit assistance with a technical point. If you feel a colleague is more qualified than you to review the paper, do not pass the manuscript on to that person without first requesting permission from the CCS Editor. Review and recommendation should also be considered confidential. Reviewers should not retain copies of submitted manuscripts and should not use the knowledge of their content for any purpose unrelated to the peer review process.

**Conflicts of Interest**
If a reviewer has any interest that might interfere in writing an objective review, the paper should be returned to the editor, unreviewed. Reviewers should disclose the conflict of interest to the editor.

**Timeliness and responsiveness**
Reviewers are responsible for acting promptly, adhering to the instructions for completing a review, and submitting it in a timely manner. Failure to do so undermines the review process. Every effort should be made to complete the review within the turnaround period requested.

**Tips for Effective Peer Reviewing**

1. When reviewing, it is always important to note a **paper's strengths**, so that the author will not lose these in the process of revision. List the three major strengths of the paper in your review report.

2. Make sure the comments you write are substantive comments. Give concrete, specific, honest constructive feedback and ask lots of questions to the authors. Indicate the improvements needed in easy to understand manner. Anything less leaves the author with no insight into the deficiencies in the submitted work.

3. A reviewer should write comments upon which the authors can act and should provide enough information that the authors and editors will understand the basis for his or her concerns. Reviewer should imagine having a dialog with the authors about the manuscript, especially the reviewer identify concerns and consider possible solutions.
4. Don’t try to “FIX” everything. DO NOT line-edit the paper; let the authors deal with the nitty-gritty in the context of their revisions.

5. The reviewers should be neither too restrictive nor too permissive in assessing the paper.

Peer-review process

A paper submitted to the Journal is reviewed anonymously by independent experts in the field (peers) to determine whether the paper is suitable for publication. In the review process, the originality, technical quality, and impact of the research work are critically evaluated, and the editors of the journal then make a publication decision on the basis of reviewers’ reports.

On the basis of the reviewer’s report, the editor makes one of the following decisions on the manuscript:

- Accept for publication without revision
- Ask for minor revision for likely acceptance
- Request major revision for another review process
- Reject outright

Turnaround Period << 10 days

The usual turnaround period for the delivery of the review report is 10 days. Every effort should be made to complete the review within the time requested. If it is not possible to meet the deadline for the review, then the reviewer should promptly decline to perform the review or should contact the editor to inquire whether some accommodation can be made to extend the turnaround time.

Contact Editor - editor@ccsarchive.org
For further information visit www.ccsarchive.org