



GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW

The Responsibility of the Peer Reviewer

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in their specialty field, and then providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their submission. It is appropriate for the Peer Reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work, and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript.

BEFORE REVIEWING

Please consider the following aspect:

1. Does the article you are being asked to review match your expertise?

If you receive a manuscript that covers a topic that does not sufficiently match your area of expertise, please notify the editor as soon as possible. Please feel free to recommend alternate reviewer of your contact with their email address and contact number.

2. Do you have time to review the paper?

Finished reviews of an article should be completed within two weeks. If you do not think you can complete the review within this time frame, please let the editor know and if possible, suggest an alternate reviewer of your contact with their email address and contact number. If you have agreed to review a paper but will no longer be able to finish the work before the deadline, please contact the editor as soon as possible.

3. Are there any potential conflicts of interests?

While conflicts of interest will not disqualify you from reviewing the manuscript, it is important to disclose all conflicts of interest to the editors before reviewing. If you have any questions about potential conflicts of interests, please do not hesitate to contact the receiving editorial office.



THE REVIEW PROCESS

When reviewing the manuscript submitted you for the peer-review, please keep the following point in mind:

1. Content Quality and Originality,

- Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
- Does it add to the canon of knowledge?
- Does the article adhere to the journal's standards?
- Is the research question an important one?
- In order to determine its originality and appropriateness for the journal, it might be helpful to think of the research in terms of what percentile it is in?
- Is it in the top 25% of papers in this field?
- You might wish to do a quick literature search using tools such as Scopus to see if there are any reviews of the area. If the research has been covered previously, pass on references of those works to the editor.

Organization and Clarity of the Manuscript

1. **Title:** Does it clearly describe the article?
2. **Abstract:** Does it reflect the content of the article?
3. **Introduction:** Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated?

Normally, the introduction should summarize relevant research to provide context, and explain what other authors' findings, if any, are being challenged or extended. It should describe the experiment, the hypothesis and the general experimental design or method.

4. **Method:**

- Does the author explain the research design?
- Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected?
- Is the design suitable for answering the question posed?
- Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research?



- Does the article identify the procedures followed?
 - Are these ordered in a meaningful way? If the methods are new, are they explained in detail?
 - Was the sampling appropriate?
 - Have the equipment and materials been adequately described?
 - Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?
 - Does the author use appropriate statistical method in the research?
5. **Results:** This is where the author/s should explain in words what he/she discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. You will need to consider the following aspects:
- Does the data is presented appropriately in tabulated and graphical way?
 - Does the author accurately use the statistical method which is being stated in method section?
 - Are the statistics correct? If you are not comfortable with statistics, please advise the editor when you submit your report. Interpretation of results should not be included in this section.
6. **Conclusion/Discussion:**
- Are the claims of the author (in this section) supported by the results stated in the result section of the manuscript?
 - Does the conclusion seem reasonable?
 - Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research?
 - Does the article support or contradict previous theories?
 - Is there appropriate justification
 - Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?



7. **Tables, Figures, Images:**

- Are they appropriate?
- Do they properly show the data?
- Are they easy to interpret and understand?

8. **Scope** - Is the article in line with the aims and scope of the journal?

ARTICLE TYPES CONSIDERED

1. **The Leading Edge (Perspectives)**

Unique perspective that both describes the experience, and relates the situation to a public health issue, health policy issue, etc

2. **Delivery Science (Original Research)**

Original Data and Trials

- Submissions should present data that offers novel approaches to improving the systems, processes, and tools involved with delivering care.

Policy Research and Observational Analyses

- Submissions should describe the feasibility, cost-effectiveness, implementation of, or results of policy concerning the delivery of health care. This includes but is not limited to policy topics such as health care reform, health IT, delivery and payment regulation, quality improvement, and comparative delivery innovation.

3. **Synthesis (Review Articles)**

Submissions should be a critical, systematic review of literature concerning issues that are relevant to the delivery of health care. Reviews should be focused on one topic

4. **Into Practice (case studies)**

Submissions should describe situations where individuals were faced with a challenge in health care delivery. The article should describe the challenge faced, the options, the thought process behind the decision made, and the lessons learned.

5. **Viewpoints**

First Person (Interviews)



Book Reviews

Technology Insight (Product Reviews)

6. In the News

Submissions should be newsworthy pieces about topics including but not limited to medical innovation, policy, information technology, health care reform, delivery and payment innovation.

7. Additional commentary evaluating and assessing the implications of the news story on health care delivery will also be considered.

FINAL COMMENTS

All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party.

If you would like to discuss the article with a colleague, please ask the editor first.

Please do not contact the author directly.

Ethical Issues:

- Plagiarism: If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, please let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible
- Fraud: It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor
- Other ethical concerns: For medical research, has confidentiality been maintained? Has there been a violation of the accepted norms in the ethical treatment of animal or human subjects? If so, then these should also be identified to the editor



Journal of Karnali Academy of Health Sciences

An Official Journal of Karnali Academy of Health Sciences

FURTHER STEPS

Please complete the “Reviewer’s Comments” form by the due date to the receiving editorial office. Your recommendation regarding an article will be strongly considered when the editors make the final decision, and your thorough, honest feedback will be much appreciated.

When writing comments, please indicate the section of comments intended for only the editors and the section of comments that can be returned to the author(s). Please never hesitate to contact the receiving editorial office with any questions or concerns you may have.