

## Manuscript Reviewing Guide

REVISED: | 06/06/2021

This **guide** contains 3 pages and has the following items:

- ❖ **HORIZON Review Process.**
- ❖ **Manuscript Reviewing Guidelines.**

HORIZON JOURNALS ASPIRE TO SELECT AND PUBLISH, THROUGH **DOUBLE-BLIND PEER-REVIEW**, THE HIGHEST QUALITY RESEARCH GLOBALLY. IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, THE ENTIRE PEER-REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD BE **THOROUGH, OBJECTIVE AND FAIR**. JOURNAL REPUTATION DEPENDS HEAVILY ON THE FAIRNESS OF THE PEER-REVIEW PROCESS.

PEER REVIEWERS ARE EXPERTS CHOSEN BY HORIZON EDITORS TO PROVIDE WRITTEN ASSESSMENT OF THE **STRENGTHS** AND **WEAKNESSES** OF WRITTEN RESEARCH, WITH THE AIM OF IMPROVING THE REPORTING OF RESEARCH AND IDENTIFYING THE MOST APPROPRIATE AND HIGHEST QUALITY MATERIAL FOR THE JOURNAL.

**Thank you for your support of *Horizon Journal***  
*Today's research, tomorrow's impact!*

## Journal's Review Process

### HORIZON Journals

REVISED 06/06/2021

**REVIEWING FOR JOURNALS IS A PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY THAT PROVIDES VALUE FOR THE PROFESSION AS A WHOLE, AND SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED.**

#### **HORIZON'S REVIEW PROCESS**

*Horizon* follows a **double-blind peer-review** process, whereby authors do not know reviewers and *vice versa*. Peer review is fundamental to the scientific publication process and the dissemination of sound science.

#### **REVIEW QUALITY**

*Horizon* considers its reviewers as experts in the scientific topics addressed in the articles they review. They provide written assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of written research with the aims to improve the reporting of research and identifying the most appropriate and highest quality material for the journal. Individuals who do not have such expertise cannot be reviewers.

Ratings of review quality and other performance characteristics is periodically assessed by the Executive Editor to assure optimal journal performance. These ratings also contribute to decisions on reappointment to the Horizon Editorial Board and to ongoing review requests. Individual performance data on Reviewers are available to the Editors but otherwise kept confidential.

Reviews are expected to be **professional, honest, courteous, prompt, and constructive**.

#### **WHAT IS EXPECTED OF REVIEWERS?**

Reviewers are welcome to recommend a particular course of action, but they should bear in mind that the other reviewers of a particular paper may have different technical expertise and/or views, and the Journal's editors may have to make a decision based on conflicting advice. The most useful reports, therefore, provide the editors with the information on which decision should be based. Setting out the arguments for and against publication is often more helpful to the editors than a direct recommendation one way or the other.

The submitted manuscript is a privileged communication; reviewers must treat it as confidential. It should not be retained or copied. Also, reviewers must not share the manuscript with any colleagues without the explicit permission of the Executive Editor.

#### **PUBLICATION ETHICS**

Plagiarism is scientific misconduct and is an unacceptable violation of publication ethics. It should be dealt with promptly.

The journal's editors and reviewers are the primary means of **detecting plagiarism** in manuscripts submitted to *Horizon* journals. If reviewers **suspect misconduct**, they should notify the Chief Executive Editor in confidence, and should not share their concerns with other parties unless officially notified by the journal that they may do so.

#### **TIMELINESS**

Reviewers should be prompt with their reviews. If a reviewer cannot meet the deadline given, he/she should contact the Chief Executive Editor as soon as possible to determine whether a longer time period or a new reviewer should be chosen. Typically, the time to complete the **first review** is **3 weeks**.

## Reviewer's Guidelines for Article Evaluation

HORIZON Journals

REVISED 06/06/2021

*Blind reviewing is a thankless task yet of such importance to the standing and quality of an academic journal. To acknowledge your valued contributions, we publish the names of our valued reviewers in our journal in each issue.*

Please state in your review report if the article **fulfils** the **criteria** below along with the **manuscript softcopy** (only if you have provided any annotations).

### Evaluation Criteria for Regular Articles

1. **Theoretical/Conceptual Soundness:** The article should make reference to previous research or theories in the reported study. The theory, if any, behind the research should be logically applied and thoroughly justified. It should correctly interpret and appropriately synthesize relevant prior research. And finally, are the hypotheses, if any, derived from the theory to be tested, clearly stated, and are they actually tested?
2. **Methodological Soundness:** Qualitative or quantitative empirical studies reported on should have a systematic and coherent method of study. The article should include a clear account of the study's project background, objectives, subjects, methodology (methods should be the most recent, if not, the relevancy/ appropriateness should be questioned), data analysis, and conclusions.

The reviewer should comment accurately and constructively upon the quality of the author's interpretation of the data, including acknowledgment of its limitations.

Are the appropriate analytical techniques applied to the data collected, and the results correctly interpreted? Are the conclusions and/or implications correctly derived from the research findings?

3. **Contribution:** Does the article advance knowledge in/of the discipline? Are the findings and their implications noteworthy? Is the paper of interest to many people in the field or at least one segment of it (e.g., academics, practitioners, public policy makers, consumers etc.)?

The article should also discuss the implications of the reported project, and/or report on any conclusions or products which may be of relevance to future research, development or practice.

4. **Communication:** The article should be of an acceptable quality in terms of linguistic accuracy, clarity and coherence. Is the article clearly written and the major points easily grasped? Is the article laid out in a logical format? Data presentation/ tabulation: Any irrelevant tables/ figures should be checked.

The reviewer should comment on **major strengths** and **weaknesses** of the manuscript as a written communication, independent of the design, methodology, results, and interpretation of the study.

5. **References:** Horizon follows APA referencing style (6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Reviewers are requested to detect if "**Each reference cited in text appears in the reference list, and each entry in the reference list is cited in text**". This will help in preventing authors to use "ghost referencing" or "phantom referencing" The authors are informed to use the rule of the thumb: **cite what you use, use what you cite**.

Horizon takes unethical publishing strictly and reports each case of to the Committee on Publication Ethics or COPE.

The reviewer's comments to the author should be constructive, professional and be sufficiently specific in order to help the author improve the article when revising it for publication or re-submission to *Horizon* journal (in the event that it is rejected by *Horizon*). If reviewers suspect **misconduct**, they should notify the Chief Executive Editor in confidence, and should not share their concerns with other parties unless officially notified by the journal that they may do so.

---

## Evaluation Criteria for Review Articles

1. Defines, clarifies, and provides a concise review of the author's argument and essential supporting information.
2. Summarizes previous investigations in order to inform the reader of the state of current research, its relevance, and provides an overall understanding of the book's contribution to scholarship
3. Identifies relations, contradictions, gaps, inaccuracies, and inconsistencies in the book
4. Identifies presence of ideological biases or exaggerations in information or argument
5. Errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure do or do not impede reading
6. Clear rhetorical structure and organization to the review.

## *Appreciation to Reviewers*

I am very grateful to all of the authors, reviewers, and JHSSR Editorial Board members for their exceptional contributions to this peer-reviewed publication.

JHSSR would not do justice without the recognition of the hard work and dedication of our prestigious reviewers. Our editorial team has put in place a reviewer appreciation that includes certificates, listing reviewers on a dedicated page in the journal, and much more.

Editing and publishing a scholarly peer-reviewed journal is an amazing as well as complex exertion that involves working with a critical mass of fascinating, highly creative, well-educated, and very productive assemblage of superb individuals. Certainly, the JHSSR could not exist without the manuscript authors, Editorial Board members, and the Ad Hoc External Manuscript Reviewers.

The ability to improve the quality of the manuscripts published in the JHSSR is largely dependent upon the strength of the double-blind peer-review process. Manuscript reviewers provide an immeasurable wealth of expertise and willingness to volunteer their time and vivacity on behalf of the journal. They put in hours of work to judge the quality and importance of work and then they determine if the article is to be revised, accepted or rejected.

I especially would like to thank and express my deepest appreciation to the individuals listed in each release of our published issue published online at <https://horizon-jhssr.com/current-issue.php>, all of whom devotedly reviewed several manuscripts submitted to the journal during 2019–2021.



### **Chief Executive Editor**

*Horizon* JHSSR, B.P.

Online ISSN 2682-9096

[CEE.horizon@gmail.com](mailto:CEE.horizon@gmail.com)

[doi.org/10.37534](https://doi.org/10.37534)