

## Reviewer Instructions (PHARMBIT)

### Peer Reviewer Instructions (What We Believe and Follow for PHARMBIT)

*Peer review in all its forms plays an important role in ensuring the integrity of the scholarly record. The process depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically. Peer reviewers play a central and critical part in the peer-review process, but too often come to the role without any guidance and may be unaware of their ethical obligations. The PHARMBIT Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers set out the basic principles and standards to which all peer reviewers should adhere during the peer-review process. It is hoped they will provide helpful guidance to researchers, be a reference for journals and editors in guiding their reviewers, and act as an educational resource for institutions in training their students and researchers.*

### Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere for PHARMBIT Publications

*Peer reviewers should:*

- 1. only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner*
- 2. respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal*
- 3. not use information obtained during the peer-review process for their own or any other person's or organization's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others*
- 4. declare all potential conflicting interests, seeking advice from the journal if they are unsure whether something constitutes a relevant interest*
- 5. not allow their reviews to be influenced by the origins of a manuscript, by the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, or by commercial considerations*
- 6. be objective and constructive in their reviews, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libellous or derogatory personal comments*
- 7. acknowledge that peer review is largely a reciprocal endeavour and undertake to carry out their fair share of reviewing and in a timely manner*
- 8. provide journals with personal and professional information that is accurate and a true representation of their expertise*
- 9. recognize that impersonation of another individual during the review process is considered serious misconduct*

PHARMBIT relies on the time and expertise of volunteer reviewers to maintain its high editorial standards. We look to reviewers to help PHARMBIT ensure the following in a submitted paper:

1. Research is well designed and executed.
2. Presentation of methods will permit replication.
3. Data are unambiguous and properly analyzed.
4. Conclusions are supported by data.
5. Review Papers with Suitable well defined Postulate/ Hypothesis

**Reviewer responsibilities to authors include the following:**

- Provide written, unbiased feedback on the scholarly merits and scientific value of the work, together with rationale for your opinion.
- Provide your review as soon as possible within 10-15 days. If you cannot do so, please contact the PHARMBIT office immediately @ [pharmbit@bitmesra.ac.in](mailto:pharmbit@bitmesra.ac.in) or +916512275444.
- Indicate whether the writing is clear, concise, and relevant and rate the work's composition, scientific accuracy, originality, and interest to readers.
- Avoid personal comments or criticism.
- Refrain from direct author contact without the editor's permission.
- Maintain the confidentiality of the review process by not sharing, discussing with third parties, or disclosing information from the reviewed paper without permission from the editorial office.

**Reviewer responsibilities to editors include the following:**

- Alert the editor to any potential personal or financial conflict of interest you may have and decline to review when a possibility of a conflict exists
- Determine scientific merit, originality, and scope of the work and suggest ways to improve it.
- Avoid comments to authors about acceptance or rejection of the paper; include such remarks as confidential comments for editors.
- Note any ethical concerns, such as substantial similarity between the reviewed manuscript and any published paper or any manuscript concurrently submitted elsewhere.

**Reviewer responsibilities to readers include the following:**

- Ensure that published articles meet PHARMBIT standards.
- Protect readers from incorrect or flawed research or studies that cannot be validated by others.
- Be alert to any failure to cite relevant work by other scientists.

## **Ethical Responsibilities of Reviewers**

### **Confidentiality**

Material under review is a privileged communication that should not be shared or discussed with anyone outside the designated review process unless necessary and approved by the editor. Reviewers should not retain copies of submitted manuscripts and should not use the knowledge of manuscript content for any purpose unrelated to the peer-review process. Although it is expected that the editor and/or reviewers will have access to the submitted material, authors have a reasonable expectation that the review process will remain strictly confidential. The review process is conducted anonymously for all submissions, except members' own contributions where the reviewers are known to the member author. Reviewers are encouraged to keep their identities from outsiders or members of the press. If you are unsure about the policies for enlisting the help of others in the review process, contact PHARMBIT @ pharmbit@bitmesra.ac.in or +916512275444.

### **Constructive Critique**

The purpose of peer review is not to demonstrate the reviewer's proficiency in identifying flaws. Reviewers should identify strengths and provide constructive comments to help authors resolve weaknesses in the work. Reviewers should respect the intellectual independence of authors and avoid personal remarks in the review. Although reviews are confidential, all comments should be courteous and capable of withstanding public scrutiny.

### **Competence**

Reviewers who realize that their expertise in the subject of the article is limited have a responsibility to make their degree of competence clear to the editor. Although reviewers need not be expert in every aspect of the content, the assignment should be accepted only if they have adequate expertise to provide an authoritative assessment.

### **Impartiality and Integrity**

Reviewer comments and conclusions should be based on an objective and impartial consideration of the facts, exclusive of personal or professional bias. All comments by reviewers should be based solely on the paper's scientific merit, originality, and quality of writing as well as on its relevance to PHARMBIT Scope.

A reviewer should not take scientific, financial, personal, or other advantage of material made available through the privileged communication of peer review, and should make every effort to avoid even the appearance of taking advantage of information obtained through the review process.

### **Conflict of Interest**

To the extent possible, the peer-review process should minimize actual or perceived bias on the reviewer's part. If reviewers have any interest that might interfere with an objective review, they should either decline to review a paper or disclose the potential conflict of interest to PHARMBIT.

### **Timeliness and Responsiveness**

Reviewers are responsible for acting promptly, adhering to the instructions for completing a review, and submitting it in a timely manner. Every effort should be made to complete the review within the requested time frame.