

PURAKALA

PEER- REVIEW POLICY

The contribution of articles, papers and notes in *Purakala* are peer-reviewed at the discretion of the editors. The specific name/s of the reviewer/s (we call them Guest Editors) of a particular paper is strictly confidential. Only his/their suggestions, queries, objections etc. are passed on to the author/s. We ask peer-reviewers to submit their reports online system by following the link provided in the editor/s' email.

We receive many more submissions of articles, papers and notes than we can publish. Therefore, we ask peer-reviewers to keep in mind that no good paper should be rejected. To be published in *Arnava*, a paper should meet following point-

- Author's paper should be original creation in point of view, in presentation, in documentation, in theme etc.
- Reasons and strong evidence/s for its conclusion.
- Neither repetitions of previous researches nor fictitious data should be incorporated.
- Multidisciplinary research is given preference.
- View to represent an advance in understanding likely to influence thinking in the related field.
- Accreditation why the work deserves publication in *Arnava*.

The Review Process

All submitted manuscripts are read by editors. To save time for authors and peer-reviewers only those papers that seem most likely to meet our editorial criteria are sent for formal review. Those papers judged by the editors to be of insufficient general interest or otherwise inappropriate are rejected promptly without external review.

Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review/s. The editors then make a decision based on the reviewer's advice, from among several possibilities:

- **Accept**, with editorial revisions
- Suggest the authors to revise their manuscripts to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached
- Reject, but indicate to the authors that further work may justify resubmission.
- **Reject out rightly**, based on grounds of specialist interest, lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual advance or major technical and/or interpretational problems.
- The editor/s will take decision for the publication of the concerned paper after receiving different views from different reviewers.
- The most useful comment therefore be provided to the editors with the information on which a decision should be taken.
- We occasionally bring in additional reviewers to resolve differences or to make the process faster.

Our primary responsibilities are to our readers and in deciding how best to provide them, we must weigh the claims of each paper against the many others also under consideration.

Selection of Peer-Reviewers

Reviewer selection is important to the publication process, and we make our choice on many factors, including expertise, reputation, specific recommendations, accessibility and briskness.

We check with potential reviewers before sending them manuscripts to review. Reviewers should bear in mind that these messages contain confidential information which should be treated as such.