

## **ALIG JOURNALS PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

Peer review process helps as one of the most significant methods for authenticating the information contained in these journals. The significance of peer review clearly varies among the different functions of journals. Peer review is generally seen as vital for the roles of forming an archive of knowledge and distributing rewards. The practice of peer review is to ensure quality research and ideas is published.

Peer review process adopted by ALIG Journals not only acts as a screening but also plays a dynamic role to upsurge the quality of research submitted for journal publications. Because of its mentoring nature ALIG journals peer review process also supports author(s) to eliminate any mistakes or gaps in manuscript erroneously overlooked and promotes in making the research more applicable in real time. With regards to international exposure, the editorial and reviewer boards of ALIG Journals comprised experts with not only having the academic background but also the researchers serving the industry. For in-depth review, at least two outside referees are consulted. Reviewers are contacted before being sent a paper and are asked to return comments within 3 to 4 weeks for most papers. Reviewers may be selected to evaluate separate components of a manuscript.

All our editorial and reviewer board members are dedicated to ensure the validity and originality of journal publications. In order to ensure that only non-plagiarized, original and high-quality research publications each manuscript is assigned to at least two editors and each editor is assigned not more than two manuscripts. This is to ensure that editors are not overburdened with the review of assigned papers. Each editor further assigns manuscript to multiple reviewers. Our editors are well known experts in their respective areas and we have seen that our editors sometimes assign a manuscript to two to four reviewers depending upon availability of their peers. Reviewers assess the manuscript for critical analysis, comparative analysis and most importantly for integrity and novelty of research work on the basis of the different standards set by the ALIG Journals and editorial board members. Once the reviewers submit review comments of the paper then the relevant (assigned) editor analyses the review comments and submit his remarks to Editor-in-Chief. Likewise, all editors who are assigned manuscripts follow the same process. At the end editor chief ensures that

at least three review comments (from reviewers) and editors' remarks are submitted for each paper in order to make the final decision of the manuscript.

### **STEPS FOR ALIG JOURNALS PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

Step 1: Authors submit their Paper/s through online submission or direct email to journal editor-in-chief.

Step 2: Editor-in-chief (EC) receives papers & doing initial evaluation and evaluate the papers as per the basic journal requirements.

Step 3: EC once finished his/her initial evaluation and if he/she found these papers as per the journal requirements (if not according to the basic journal requirements then straightforward rejection from the desk of EC) then EC forward these papers to selected associate editor/s for their comments.

Step 4: Assigned Associate Editors then review these papers within 3/4 weeks' time period and send it to the two to four reviewers for their comments.

Step 5: Selected Journal Reviewers who selected by associated editors based on their specialty and research interest, gives their comments within the stated period of time (6/8 weeks) to the associate editors.

Step 6: Once receiving comments from reviewers almost after two or three months then Associate Editors again re-evaluated the comments of reviewers for double check.

Step 7: After taking one more time period, associate editors send their own feedback and reviewers' comments to the editor-in-chief for his/her final decision on the acceptance or rejection decision.

Step 8: Editor-in-chief forward these comments to the author/s and finally after modifications done by the author/s, EC may able to take decision.