

GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPT REVIEWERS

Guidelines for reviewers of papers received for publication in ‘The microFINANCE REVIEW’, other Study/ Research Reports to be published by Bankers Institute of Rural Development (BIRD), Lucknow

Expectations from Referee/ Reviewer

A referee is expected to offer constructive comments on the manuscript within a reasonable time (say 15 days) which will enable the editors in maintaining the quality of the papers appearing in “The microFINANCE REVIEW” journal and other study/ research report being published by BIRD and to guide the authors by offering critical suggestions on their efforts in order to help them improve their manuscript/ paper/ report or understand the reasons for rejection.

The reviewer must consider the theme and focus of the paper/report, objectives, conceptual framework, soundness of the methodology, quality of data, appropriateness of sample design and statistical analysis and its application in validating the hypothesis being tested in the paper/report, the interpretation of results, strongness of discussion/ arguments and the strength/ validity of conclusions. The reviewer has to keep in mind the standards and policies of BIRD/ CMR/ Journal when he/she reviews the paper/report.

The reviewer is also expected to comment on the editorial problems (typographical errors, misspellings) of the manuscript. The reviewer is expected to identify sentences or paragraphs with erroneous, ambiguous words or language errors which are not able to communicate the concept or result in conceptual misstatements. He/ she should point out errors in referencing.

The reviewer should also comment on the length and the structure of the manuscript, the writing quality, the clarity, accuracy, and completeness of the figures and tables, the accuracy and adequacy of the introduction which frames the area of the research, of the discussions of prior and related work, and of the citations to the literature.

The comments should be clear, concise, and accurate. Comments and recommendations should be supported with citations to specific areas in the text of the paper so that the author should be able identify the areas for improvement. The critiques offered by reviewer should not be rude, sarcastic or obscene.

Sanctity of Manuscript

- The manuscripts under review as well as the outcome and contents of the review are confidential documents. These are unpublished data and ideas, which must be kept confidential.
- Reviewer should not share the paper/ report or its contents with his/ her colleagues otherwise it may create serious problems for everyone involved in the review process.
- Reviewer should not use the information in the paper in his/ her own research or cite it in his/ her publications.
- The reviewer has an ethical obligation to approve good quality research efforts while appropriately challenge flawed papers/ reports.

Editorial independence

Editorial independence should be respected. The Editorial Board is not always bound by the comments of the reviewers on the manuscript and it may decide to overrule the comments based on other merits of the paper/ report or refer it to another reviewer for a second opinion. Decision of the Editorial Board is final in this regard.