

**Jana Bhawana Campus
Research Management Cell**

Guidelines for the Publication of Peer-Reviewed Journal

Since its establishment, Jana Bhawana Campus has been engaged in providing quality education and has emerged as a leading higher institution. As a leading higher education institution, it has always emphasized to develop and enhance research culture within it. And, recognizing the fact that academic publications enables faculties and students to cultivate research culture in them, the Research Management Cell (RMC) of Jana Bhawana Campus (JBC) has formulate a set of criteria and guidelines to meet the minimum standards and bases for the publication of peer-reviewed journal with an aim to standardization and evaluation of academic publication of researchers, faculties and students.

Section 1: Definitions

- a) **Advisor:** means a person with responsibility to provide advice to the publisher and editors of a journal.
- b) **Editor-In-Chief:** means the Chief of the Editorial Board.
- c) **Editor:** means a person with editorial responsibilities including carrying out peer-review of articles by competent reviewers, editing, publishing and maintaining the standard of the journal.
- d) **Author:** (also a contributor) means the researcher and the author of an article submitted to a journal.
- e) **Best practices:** means a set of desirable practices expected to impart the highest standard to the job.
- f) **Cite Score:** means Scopus database and citation-based journal ranking made available by Elsevier B.V.
- g) **Code of Conduct:** means a set of mandatory practices for carrying out the job ethically and responsibly.
- h) **Conflict of interest:** means a situation in which one's judgment may be potentially influenced towards a bias due to any potential interest that exists.
- i) **Digital Object Identifier (DOI):** means a unique ID for the document made available by International DOI Foundation (IDF) upon request.
- j) **Discipline:** means a particular area of study characterized by a set of related subjects, research methodology, and methods.
- k) **Coordinator:** means a person designated for the post of RMC coordinator.
- l) **Funding:** means research grant or any financial support received for a research work or by a researcher.
- m) **Journal Policies:** mean a set of policies adopted by Janabhawana Research Journal to define all processes and issues in relation to its functions.
- n) **Journal:** means a periodical publication made by Jana Bhawana Campus in which academic research relating to a particular academic discipline is published.

- o) **Non-peer reviewed:** means a journal that does not employ a peer-review process for evaluating a manuscript submitted for publication.
- p) **Peer-review:** means an evaluation of a manuscript of a scholarly work by experts from the same field in order to ensure that the work meets the necessary standards before acceptance by a journal for publication.
- q) **Peer-reviewed journal:** means a journal that employs a peer-review process for evaluating a manuscript submitted for publication.
- r) **Predatory:** means fraudulent or misleading to innocent people.
- s) **Professional society:** means a formally established organization of scholars belonging to a particular discipline or area of study.
- t) **Research ethics:** means a set of ethical principles prescribed by government agencies or professional societies for the researcher to follow when conducting research.
- u) **Research Misconduct:** means activity regarded as research misconduct such as fabrication, falsification, plagiarism and harmful activities.

Section 2

Janabhawana Research Journal

As a leading higher education institution, Jana Bhawana Campus has always emphasized to develop and enhance research culture within it. And, recognizing the fact that academic publications enables faculties and students to cultivate research culture in them, the Research Management Cell (RMC) of Jana Bhawana Campus (JBC) publishes a peer-reviewed journal namely "Janabhawana Research Journal". It also obtains the DOI for the articles published in it. Janabhawana Research Journal is a double blind review journal. Review of a manuscripts generally takes a period of 2 weeks. The editorial board makes the final decision.

Section 3

3.1 Scope and Focus of Journal:

Janabhawana Research Journal aims to disseminate very high quality research in the area of social sciences. It is a peer reviewed journal which publishes works from a wide range of fields including social sciences from a wide range of fields including sociology, anthropology, economics, social work, education, history, linguistics, political science, psychology, conflict study, agriculture, forestry, management, literature, information technology, public health, environment etc. It is published annually by Jana Bhawana Campus. The Janabhawana Research Journal accepts contribution from researchers in Nepal as well as from all over the world.

3.2 Statement on the standard of contribution

Janabhawana Research Journal accepts high quality research articles from a well-designed study and with findings that have potential to make an impact on the respective field of study measurable by citation in scholarly articles, policy documents and discussions in forums of concerned stakeholders.

4. Composition of the Editorial Board

The composition of the Editorial Board of Janabhawana Research Journal will be as following for the purpose to carry out editorial process for the publication of research articles fulfilling the minimum standards required for the peer-reviewed journal publication.

Editor-in-Chief: 1

Members: 4

The members of the Editorial Board can be added as per the requirements. The RMC can make decision to add editorial board members.

Section 5

Guidelines to the Editorial Board

The general guidelines of the Editorial Board members of "Janabhawana Research Journal" are as:

5.1 Duties and Responsibilities

- . Actively seek the views of authors, readers, reviewers and editorial board members about ways of improving their journal's processes
- . Encourage and be aware of research into peer review and reassess journal processes in the light of new findings
- . Perform role in a professional manner and raise the quality of their journal
- . Support initiatives designed to reduce academic misconduct
- . Support initiatives to educate researchers about publication ethics
- . Assess the effects of the journal policies on author and reviewer behavior and revise policies, as required, to encourage responsible behavior and discourage misconduct

5.2 Relations with readers

- Ensure that all published reports of research have been reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers
- Adopt processes that encourage accuracy, completeness and clarity of research reporting
- Adopt authorship or contributorship systems that promote good practice and discourage misconduct (e.g. ghost and guest authors)
- Publish clear instructions in their journals about submission and what they expect from authors
- Provide guidance about criteria for authorship and/or who should be listed as a contributor
- Review author instructions regularly and provide links to relevant guidelines
- Assure all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication
- Ensure that appropriate reviewers are selected for submissions
- Encourage reviewers to comment on ethical questions and possible research misconduct raised by submissions, (e.g. unethical research design, insufficient detail on patient consent or protection of research subjects)
- Encourage reviewers to ensure the originality of submissions and be alert to redundant publication and plagiarism
- Consider providing reviewers with tools to detect related publications (e.g. links to cited references and bibliographic searches)
- Seek to acknowledge the contribution of reviewers to the journal
- Encourage academic institutions to recognize peer-review activities as part of the scholarly process
- Monitor the performance of peer reviewers and take steps to ensure this is of high quality

- Develop and maintain a database of suitable reviewers, and update this on the basis of reviewer performance
- Remove from the journal's database any reviewers who consistently produce discourteous, poor quality or late reviews
- Consult editorial board members regularly (at least once a year) to gauge their opinions about the running of the journal, inform them of any changes to journal policies, and identify future challenges

Section 6

Editorial and peer-review processes

The editorial board should ensure the followings:

- Ensure that people involved with the editorial process (including themselves) receive adequate training and keep abreast of the latest guidelines, recommendations and evidence about peer review and journal management
- Keep informed about research into peer review and technological advances
- adopt peer-review methods best suited for their journal and the research community
- Review peer-review practices periodically to see if improvement is possible
- Request evidence of ethical research approval for all relevant submissions.

All the submitted manuscripts will undergo a process that begins after the submission of manuscript by the author. After ensuring all the required documents, the manuscript is desk reviewed by the editorial team. The team can request for reformat and revision, approve for revision or reject it. If the manuscript is approved for revision by the editorial team, then it further processed for external double blinded review. It follows the process ahead as per the flowchart attached in **Annex-1**.

Section 7

7.1 Guidelines to the Author

Authors should follow the guidelines to the Author as per **Annex 2**.

The authors have to submit manuscript information and submission letter as per **Annex 3 and Annex 4** respectively.

7.2 Reviewer's Guideline

Reviewers should follow reviewer's guidelines as per **Annex-5**

7.3 Reviewer's Checklist

Reviewers should adopt the checklist as per **Annex 6**. However, the editorial board can make necessary changes as per the requirement.

Annex 1: Flowchart

Annex 2

NECESSARY DOCUMENTS FOR MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION

WORD LIMITS

Original Articles: Up to 5000-7000 words excluding references; up to 30 references; and abstract of maximum 150 words including 3-5 keywords

Letter to the Editor: Up to 400 words and 5 references

Short Communication: Up to 1500 words excluding references and up to 10 references.

GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPT PREPARATION

Manuscripts must be prepared in accordance with recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work.

GENERAL STRUCTURE OF MANUSCRIPTS FOR PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION

- . Title
- . Authors
- . Authors' affiliation
- . Corresponding author
- . Corresponding author affiliation and contact details
- . Abstract
 - o Introduction
 - o Methods
 - o Results
 - o Conclusion
 - o Keywords
- . Introduction
- . Methods
- . Results
- . Discussion
- . Conclusion
- . Conflict of interest
- . Acknowledgements (not mandatory)
- . References

DESCRIPTION OF FORMAT FOR ORIGINAL ARTICLES

Title

The title should be 'simple, brief, clear and attractive'; should accurately describe the contents of manuscript, and make readers want to read further; should be in title case i.e., major words capitalized and minor words in lowercase Maximum permitted length is 15-20 words.

Author(s)

The author names should be in the format of <*First name full*>_<*Middle name full*>_<*Last name full*> e.g., Ram Prasad Nepal. Separate author names with comma; indicate with superscript numerals after names if authors are affiliated with different institutions.

Abstract

The abstract should provide the context or background for the study and should state the a) study purpose b) major methodology c) major findings and d) conclusion. It should emphasize new and important aspects of the study or observations.

Write the section label "Abstract" in bold title case and centered below title and name of the authors.

Keywords

3 to 5 keywords or short phrases that capture the main topics of the article should be provided for cross-indexing. The keywords should be arranged in the alphabetical order being separated by commas and a space followed by the keywords in lowercase (but capitalize proper nouns). Write "Keywords:" in italic line below the abstract, indented 0.5 in.

Introduction

The introduction should provide a background for the study (i.e., the nature of the problem and its significance). State the specific purpose or research objective, or hypothesis tested by, the study or observation. The research objective should be sharply focused when stated as a question. All the objectives should be made clear, and any pre-specified subgroup analyses should be described.

Methods

The methods section should contain study area, operational definitions, data, data analysis.

Statistical methods should be described with enough detail to enable a knowledgeable reader with access to the original data to verify the reported results. When possible, quantify findings and present them with appropriate indicators of measurement error or uncertainty (such as

confidence interval). Define statistical terms, abbreviations, and symbols. Specify the computer software used.

Results

Present your results in logical sequence in text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings first. Extra or supplementary materials and technical detail can be published only in the electronic version of journal.

When data are summarized in the results section, give numeric results not only as derivatives (for example, percent) but also as the absolute numbers from which they were calculated. Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support. Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries; do not duplicate data in graphs and tables.

Discussion

Emphasize the new and important aspects of the study and the conclusions that follow from them.

Do not repeat in detail data or other materials given in the Introduction or the results section. State the limitations of the study, and explore the implications of the findings for future research and for clinical practice.

Conclusion

Link the conclusions with the goals of the study, but avoid unqualified statements and conclusions not adequately supported by the data. It should be short and to the point rather than a summary of the article. Avoid claiming priority and alluding to work that has not been completed.

References

References should be typed at the end of the manuscript Please follow the format described later in guidelines. Follow APA 7th edition for referencing

LANGUAGE, SCRIPT, FONT AND STYLE

- . The manuscripts should be written in English or Nepali language and Modern Latin script.
- . The American English system of spelling should be used.
- . The language should be simple, clear and correct without grammatical errors.
- . The manuscript should be typed in Times New Roman font with 12 font size.
- . The manuscript text should be arranged in a single column.
- . The manuscript text should be justified.

USE OF NUMBERS

Follow the undermentioned rules in use of numbers in your write-up.

- . Do not start any sentence with a number. In such cases, either spell out the numbers, as in “Thirty percent of the participants . . .” or rephrase the sentence, as in “Among the participants, 30% . . .”
- . Spell out fractions that are less than one e.g. one-fifth, two-thirds, etc., except when the wording becomes awkward

USE OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

- . The full forms of the abbreviations should precede its first use in the text unless it is a standard unit of measurement
- . Use only standard abbreviations
- . Do not start any sentence with an abbreviation. Abbreviations are acceptable at the start only if they are words in their own right or represent names of organizations
- . Avoid use of abbreviations in title as far as possible
- . Do not use symbols like @ and & in the text.

USE OF UNITS OF MEASUREMENT

- . Measurements of length, height, weight, and volume should be reported in metric units (meter, kilogram, or liter) or their multiples.
- . The units for reporting measurements should be local or International System of Units (SI).

USE OF TABLES

- . Tables should be self-explanatory and include a brief, descriptive title at the top.
- . Tables should be numbered with Arabic numerals.
- . Footnotes to tables, indicated by lower case letters are accepted, but they should not include extensive detail.
- . Make sure that each table is cited in the text.
- . If you use data from another published or unpublished source, obtain permission and acknowledge them fully.

USE OF FIGURES

- . Figures used should be of the highest possible quality, free of defects, and not significantly altered.
- . Figures should be numbered with Arabic numerals and include a brief, descriptive title at the bottom.

- . Make sure that each figure is cited in the text.
- . If an already published figure has been used, acknowledge the original source and submit written permission from the copyright holder to reproduce the material.

FORMAT FOR USE OF P-VALUES

The authors are requested to heed the following rules while reporting *p*-values:

- . The '*p*' is always lowercase and italicized.
- . Use 0 before the decimal point for *p*-value. e.g. use $p < 0.001$ and not $p < .001$
- . The actual *p*-values should be written ($p = 0.04$) rather than just expressing the statement of inequality ($p < 0.05$), unless $p < 0.001$.
- . The *p*-values should not be reported only as significant or not significant without providing the exact *p*-values
- . If $p > 0.01$ then the *p*-value should always be expressed to two decimal digits by rounding whether or not it is significant. e.g. $p = 0.08$ and not $p = 0.084$
- . A three decimal digit for *p*-value > 0.01 is acceptable only if rounding would change the significance of a value. e.g. $p = 0.049$ instead of 0.05.
- . If $p < 0.01$, it should be expressed to three digits. e.g. $p = 0.003$
- . If $p < 0.001$, it should be reported as $p < 0.001$, instead of the actual exact *p*-value.
- . The *p*-value = 0.000 which is produced in result/ output by various statistical software is not used in publication and should be written as $p < 0.001$.

REFERENCE AND CITATION

The reference format for *Janabhawana Research Journal* is based on APA 7th edition referencing style.

Citations

- . Use author data citation method.
- . Narrative citation: write out the author's name as you write their quote, or paraphrase their work
- . Parenthetical Citation: Use this type of citation when it is not easy to use narrative citation, and identify authors' names in-text. Include names and dates in parentheses.
- . In case of multiple authors, list up to the first three (3) authors followed by et al

Reference list

- . References should be arranged in alphabetical order and listed at the end of manuscript.
- . Use an hanging indent to separate each list item.
- . Use APA 7th edition for referencing.

Annex-3: Manuscript Information

1. Title of the article (*Maximum 15-20 words; should be 'simple, brief, clear and attractive'; should accurately describe the contents of your manuscript, and makes readers want to read further; should be in title case i.e. major words are capitalized and minor words are in lowercase*):

.....

2. Running title of the article (*Short title of maximum 6-8 words, indicating major features of the article, will be kept as the header of the article in print*):

.....

3. Authors (*Format: <First name full>_<Middle name>_<Last name full> e.g. Madan Kumar Dahal; separate author names with comma; indicate with superscript numerals after names if authors are affiliated with different institutions*):

.....

4. Authors' affiliation (*Indicate by preceding with superscript numerals before institute names if authors are affiliated with different institutions*):

.....

5. Corresponding author details:

Name (*Format: <First name full>_<Middle name >_<Last name full> e.g. Madan Kumar Dahal*) :

Full academic qualification :

Affiliation :

Contact number :

Email :

6. Manuscript details (*Please ensure that these comply with the manuscript preparation guidelines*):

a. Number of pages :

b. Word count for abstract :

c. Number of keywords :

d. Word count for article text :

e. Number of table :

f. Number of figure :

g. Number of references :

7. Sources of financial support (*in the form of grants if any*):

.....

8. Conflict of interest:

.....

9. Acknowledgements:

.....

Annex-4: Submission Letter

Date :

To,

The Editor-in-Chief,
Jana Bhawana Journal
Lalitpur, Nepal.

Subject : Submission of manuscript entitled “Title” to Jana Bhawana Journal for publication.

Dear Sir,

I/We, on behalf of all the co-authors, would like to submit my/our aforementioned manuscript to Jana Bhawana Journal for publication.

This manuscript describes/explains/explores/studies [explain the significance of your manuscript].

The following mandatory documents have been included/attached with this submission:

- ☐ Submission letter*
- ☐ Authorship letter*
- ☐ Declaration letter[#]
- ☐ Ethical approval letter[#]
- ☐ Manuscript information page[†]
- ☐ Manuscript[†]
 - ☐ Images (if used) attached separately in email
 - ☐ Questionnaire (if questionnaire based study)

** both e-copy (docx format) and scanned copies needed*

scanned copy only † e-copy (docx format) only

We humbly request you to consider this manuscript for prospective publication. We agree to abide by the decision of the Editorial Committee of Jana Bhawana Journal regarding this manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

Primary author

.....

Signature

Name :

Organization :

Mobile :

Email :

Corresponding author

.....

Signature

Name :

Organization :

Mobile :

Email :

Annex- 5: Reviewer's Guideline

This General Guidance for Reviewers aims to assist the Editor in making a fair, evidence-based decision that aligns with the journal's editorial criteria. Additionally, review reports should provide constructive feedback to authors, helping them improve their paper to meet the standards for publication which should be backed up by the Reviewers Checklist. If a recommendation to reject the paper is given, the report should clearly outline the major weaknesses of the research, enabling the authors to enhance their manuscript.

Feel free to share confidential comments with the Editor, but please ensure that they do not contradict the main points presented in the report for the authors.

Peer reviewers must evaluate papers solely based on the journal's criteria for publication.

Please adhere to the following conventions:

- Conduct reviews with objectivity.
- Avoid personal criticism of the author and refrain from making defamatory or libelous remarks.
- Present views clearly, supporting them with well-founded arguments and references.
- Disclose any potential competing interests as a reviewer.
- Decline reviewing manuscripts in cases where a competing interest arises from relationships or connections with the authors, companies, or institutions involved in the papers.
- Maintain confidentiality of the materials provided for review and refrain from discussing unpublished manuscripts with colleagues or using the information for personal work.
- If a reviewer wishes to pass a peer review invitation to a colleague, they must first contact the journal directly.

To evaluate different aspects of a manuscript, we request reviewers to address the following aspects:

Key Results: Kindly provide a summary of the exceptional aspects you identify in the work.

Validity: Please assess if the manuscript contains any flaws that would impede its publication. If so, kindly provide specific details.

Originality and Significance: If the conclusions lack originality, please include relevant references to support your assessment.

Data & Methodology: Please assess the validity of the approach, the quality of the data, and the clarity of its presentation. It is important to review all data, including extended data and supplementary information. Additionally, consider whether the reporting of data and methodology is detailed and transparent enough to allow for result reproduction.

Appropriate Use of Statistics and Treatment of Uncertainties: Check if all error bars are appropriately defined in the corresponding figure legends. Provide specific comments on the

suitability of any statistical tests used and the accuracy of the description of error bars and probability values in your report.

Conclusions: Evaluate whether the conclusions and data interpretation are strong, valid, and reliable.

Inflammatory Material: Check for any inappropriate or potentially libelous language in the manuscript.

Suggested Improvements: Offer constructive suggestions to enhance the work through revisions.

References: Assess whether the manuscript appropriately references previous literature. If necessary, suggest additional references or exclude irrelevant ones.

Clarity and Context: Evaluate the abstract's clarity and accessibility. Assess whether the abstract, introduction, and conclusions are appropriate.

Scope of Expertise: If there are any parts of the manuscript, data, or analyses beyond your expertise or that you couldn't fully assess, please indicate them.

Ensure you address any other specific questions raised by the editor.

Verify if the author(s) have adhered to Janabhawana Research Journal's Guidelines.

Reviewers should promptly notify the Editor-in-Chief or the designated contact person from Janabhawana Research Journal if they wish to report any allegations of publication or research misconduct, such as plagiarism or image manipulation, related to the article under review.

Before submitting your report, consider the following issues:

- how the authors would feel if they received it.
- check if the tone is courteous and professional,
- avoid unnecessary personal remarks or antagonistic comments about the authors.
- note that the Editor reserves the right to remove any inappropriate language from your report.
- reports should document the peer reviewer's thought process, and while they don't need to follow a specific order.
- all statements should be well-justified and detailed, supported by facts and relevant references.
- reviewers are encouraged to comment on all aspects relevant to the manuscript that they feel qualified to address.
- however, all aspects mentioned above may not apply to every paper due to discipline-specific standards.
- reviewers can seek guidance from the Editor if unsure about discipline-specific peer-reviewing standards.

Regarding jurisdictional claims and institutional affiliations in published maps, Janabhawana Research Journal remains neutral, and naming conventions are left to the authors' discretion. Peer reviewers should avoid requesting changes to such information unless it significantly impacts the clarity of the academic content.

Janabhawana Research Journal is dedicated to expediting editorial decisions and publication to serve authors and the research community effectively. Reviewers are requested to respond promptly within the agreed-upon timeframe. If any delays are anticipated, reviewers are encouraged to inform the journal to keep the authors informed and, if necessary, find alternative solutions.

Data Notes

A peer reviewer's report should furnish the Editorial Board with the necessary information to make a decision, guiding authors on strengthening their paper for potential publication.

Reviewers are encouraged to request additional data sets or information when required to support the data. However, they should refrain from seeking extensive follow-up experimentation or confirmation of specific hypotheses or interpretations beyond the scope of a data note manuscript. In-depth analyses or new scientific conclusions should be excluded from submitted data notes as advised by the reviewers.

The evaluation of a data note must not be influenced by the perceived impact or novelty of the findings associated with the datasets. The peer-review process should remain focused on assessing data quality and reusability, without emphasizing specific interpretations.

Furthermore, the reviewer should ensure thorough adherence to the reviewer's checklist.

Annex-6: Reviewer's Checklist

Please read the manuscript thoroughly and seek answers to the following questions/guidance as a preparation for writing a review

First read through

- . Is it clear what the authors want to communicate and the direction of the manuscript?
- . Is the research/manuscript original?
- . Does the article make contribution to the field of the study?
- . Is the presentation clear and concise?
- . Is the overall design and approach appropriate?
- . Has the appropriate structure and language been used?

Detailed review- Research articles

Title

- . Does it express clearly what the manuscript is about?
- . Does it highlight the importance of the study?
- . Does it contain any unnecessary description?
- . Is it concise and informative?
- . Can it be re-written in a better way?

Abstract

- . Is it a short and clear summary of the aims and key methods?
- . Does it include enough information to stand alone?
- . Does it contain unnecessary information?
- . Is it really a summary?
- . Does it include key findings?
- . Does it include important conclusions
- . Is it in an appropriate length?

Key Words

- . Are they in addition to the words in the title?
- . Are they appropriate and adequate?

Introduction

- . Does it give enough detail about the context, goals, problems, and/or research questions?
- . Does it clearly explain why the study was necessary?
- . Does it clearly define the aim of the study and is this consistent with the rest of the manuscript?
- . Is the research question clear and appropriate?
- . Does it present a sound current evidence base? Is it grounded in theory and research?
- . Does it has clearly given citation wherever needed?.
- . Are any important findings from previous studies omitted or misrepresented?

- . Is it clear, well organized and effective to create curiosity?

Methodology

- . Are the study design and methods appropriate for the research question?
- . Is there enough detail to repeat the experiments?
- . Is it clear how samples were collected or how participants were recruited?
- . Is there any potential bias in the sample or in the recruitment of participants?
- . Are the correct controls/ validation included?
- . Are any potential confounding factors considered?
- . Has any randomization been done correctly?
- . Is the time-frame of the study sufficient to see outcomes?
- . Is there sufficient power and appropriate statistics?
- . For qualitative research, is there any care taken to avoid/reduce researcher bias and cognitive error? What do you feel about the possibility of bias and error in the study?

Results

- . Are the results presented clearly and accurately?
- . Do the results presented match the methods?
- . Have all the relevant data been included?
- . Suggest improvements in the way data is shown
- . Is the data described in the text consistent with the data in the figures and tables?
- . Comment on the number of figures, tables, and schemes
- . Suggest additional experiments or analyses
- . Make clear the need for changes/updates.

Discussion and Conclusion

- . Do the authors logically explain the findings?
- . Do the authors compare the findings with current findings in the research field?
- . Are the conclusions supported by the data presented?
- . Comment on importance, validity, and generality of conclusions
- . Are any contradictory data discussed?
- . Request toning down of unjustified claims and generalizations
- . Request removal of redundancies
- . Request removal of summarization.

Tables and Figures

- . Are data presented in a clear and appropriate manner?
- . Is the presentation of tables and figures consistent with the description in text?
- . Comment on figures, their quality, and readability
- . Do the figure legends and table headings, axis labels clearly explain what is shown?
- . Comment on any footnotes

- . Do the figures and tables include measures of uncertainty, such as standard error or confidence intervals, where required as well as the sample size?
- . Check presentation consistency
- . Do you have any concerns about the manipulation of data?

References

- . Are there any key references missing?
- . Do the authors cite the initial discoveries where suitable?
- . Are there places where the authors cite a review but should cite the original paper?
- . Check citation appropriateness

Manuscript Review Report to Jana Bhawana Journal

1. Manuscript ID: _____

Name of Reviewer: _____

2. Does the area of manuscript fall under the expertise of the reviewer?

3. Does the area of the manuscript within the scope and focus of Jana Bhawana Journal?

4. Outline of the manuscript

Please write a summary of the manuscript outlining key information about the research presented.

5. Major Criticism

Please be specific and give details

6. Minor Criticism

Please be specific and give details

7. Recommendation to Editor

(a) Recommendation category - Please select your recommendation category

- . Accept the manuscript without any change in content
- . Accept the manuscript with a minor revision of the content
- . Accept the manuscript with major revision
- . Reject the manuscript with an option for resubmission
- . Reject the manuscript

(b) Full recommendation

Please elaborate on your recommendation

Signature:

Name of Reviewer: