

About the Peer reviewers and review process

- ✚ In this journal we follow a full double-blind peer review that neither the reviewer nor the author(s) know the identity of each other.
- ✚ At least two experts from the relevant discipline whose academic rank is assistant professor and above is expected to review the submitted manuscript/s.
- ✚ The reviewers have the right to declare any conflicts of interests, if any.
- ✚ Reviewers are not expected to provide a thorough language editing or copyediting of a manuscript, but asked to check whether the manuscript is scientifically sound and coherent, original, and whether the quality of the writing is acceptable to focus on its scientific quality for the overall style.
- ✚ If reviewers recognize that a manuscript requires language editing, they should inform both to the author/s and the editor in the report.
- ✚ Reviewers are also asked to be polite and constructive in their reports.
- ✚ Reviewers are expected to fill-in the evaluation format as adequately as possible in a way that direct a decision to be made by the editorial board as well.
- ✚ Reviewers should keep all information regarding papers confidential and treat them as privileged information.
- ✚ Reviewers should also call to the editors' attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.
- ✚ Manuscripts will be kept in the reviewers only for two weeks since acceptance.
- ✚ The journal allows a maximum of two rounds of review of a manuscript. The first review round is an intense and detailed one requiring the decision to be made on the manuscript.
- ✚ During a second review round, the reviewers are asked to evaluate whether the revised version of the manuscript is up to his/her recommendations submitted during the first review round.
- ✚ There are three possible decisions on the manuscript to be made: (1) Accept with minor revisions, (2) Accept with major revisions, and (3) Reject.

Minor revisions with a re-submission

- ✚ The article is conditionally accepting pending minor revisions. That is, if the author makes the minor revisions the editor and the reviewers have specified, the article will be published.
- ✚ Here, when the revised manuscript is returned, only the editor reviews it to make sure the changes have been made.

Major revisions with a re-submission

- ✚ The article is conditionally accepted pending major revisions. That is, if the author makes the major revisions the editor & the reviewers have specified, the article will be published.
- ✚ When the author returned the revised manuscript, the manuscript will go through the peer review process again.
- ✚ In any case authors are encouraged to revise and re-submit their manuscripts, yet there is no guarantee that the revised submission will be accepted if they are not able to meet the essential revision.
- ✚ Reconsider rejected manuscripts if the author provides good reasons why the decision may have been wrong and is willing to revise the manuscript in response to the valid comments of the reviewers and editors.

Rejection

- ✚ Manuscripts failed to meet the scope, style and formats of the CJEBS will automatically be rejected.
- ✚ Yet, manuscripts that meet the submission guideline (style &formats) and the scope of the journal initially will be assigned to the reviewers for a review yet depending on the reviewers' comments and decisions; manuscripts will be rejected by the reviewers.
- ✚ They provide feedback on the paper, suggest improvements and make a recommendation to the editor about whether to accept, reject or request changes to the article.