

Peer Review

It is a process, where experts (researcher, scientist and fellow specialist, who are not a part of the editorial team) evaluate the quality and do critical assessment of other researcher' scientific work and advise editors on its importance.

The objective of the process is to ensure that manuscript

- a) uses past research and adds to existing literature
- b) is scientifically coherent.
- c) these papers once published, should be more read and more cited.

The Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology of India (JOGI) follows a “double blind” peer review system – the peer reviewers do not know the identity of the authors and the authors do not know the evaluators. Interactions between reviewers, authors and editors are not published.

Peer Reviewer

Peer reviewers play a crucial and critical role in building the reputation and prestige of the journal by reviewing the manuscript in a professional, scientific, ethical and accountable manner so that only quality articles are accepted and published

Peer Review: Prerequisites

JOGI send an email inviting the experts of the subjects from its data base to review a manuscript. The mail provides an abstract of the study, a link to either accept or reject the invitation along with specific instructions and time frame to complete review. Once an invitation from JOGI is received to peer-review, it is expected that peer reviewer will:-

- a) Decline the invitation if any of the authors are currently employed at the same institution or have been close collaborators of peer reviewer or any relationship between authors and peer reviewer will result in a biased review.
- b) Declare all potential competing, or conflicting, interests. Competing interests may be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious in nature.
- c) Respond within a reasonable time-frame, even if review cannot be undertaken.
- d) Agree only those papers which focus on a topic within their area of expertise
- e) Agree only if review can be returned within the proposed time-frame. Always inform the journal promptly if circumstances changes and an extension of time are required.
- f) Familiarize with specific reviewer instructions, required ethics and policy statements etc of the JOGI and follow them.

Peer Review: Process

The editor expects a fair, objective, constructive and unbiased evaluation highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. First step is to read carefully and

thoroughly the manuscript and supplementary files, if any. It is important to remain unbiased and maintain confidentiality.

JOGI should be notified immediately if :

- a) If anything is not clear or any item /information are missing or incomplete
- b) If necessary expertise to assess a particular relevant aspect of a manuscript (e.g. statistics) is not available.
- c) If there is substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article.
- d) If any irregularities with respect to research and publication ethics is noticed.

Peer Review: Report

- All peer reviewers should be familiar with the format of the articles and 'instructions to the author' framed by JOGI.
- It is necessary to follow instructions for writing and submitting the review.
- JOGI follows a format for scoring marks in the evaluation sheet. These are the confidential comments to the editor.
- It is desirable to look for similar publications on the same topic or publication of part of data elsewhere.
- In another part, the reviewer provides comments to the corresponding author. These comments are further passed on to the author for improving the manuscript, even if it is not found suitable for publication.
- The focus should be on paper structure, hypothesis, sample size, source of data, methods of investigation and their description, methodology, appropriateness of statistics, interpretation and missing information, flow of information and conclusion.
- Each section of the manuscript (Abstract, Introduction, Material & Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, References, etc) should be read carefully and commented upon specifically. Any missing analysis should be recorded and comment should be made for additional analysis/ investigations within the scope of the study to bring more clarity to the work.
- Discussion should be connected to the data and result of the study. Conclusion should justify the objective of the study.
- References should be up to date and in accordance with JOGI requirement (Vancouver style).
- The report should be constructive in nature and any recent information or references may be added for consideration by the author.
- Finally, originality (contribution to the existing literature) and novelty of the observations should also be judged.

- Finally, a recommendation to accept/revise/reject the article is made. Any recommendation should be congruent with the report of the article.
- The points should be made specific along with supporting evidence and appropriate references to substantiate general statements. The comments should be made in a professional manner without any personal comments or unfounded accusations.
- In the second part of the report, any error in writing, spelling mistakes, mislabeling of table or figure, mismatch of numbers/ data in various sections (abstract, result, tables and discussion) can be highlighted and corrected.
- It is better to summarize the article and highlight the strengths and weakness of the article depending on its scientific quality. It is expected that a report either in the form of critique or accolades, is needed to convince the editor regarding rejection or acceptance of the article.