

Pakistan Journal of Physiology

Guidelines for Reviewers

We fully appreciate and are very grateful that you are contributing to PJP on a voluntary basis in addition to your busy academic, research and other official duties. Please inform the editor as early as possible if you can/cannot review the manuscript due to any reason. It is appreciated to advise the editor of an approximate date that you can complete the review. Reminders of deadlines will be sent automatically from online journal system.

Ethical responsibilities of a Reviewer

Reviewers are requested to keep in mind that one important aspect of the review process is to help the authors to improve their work, so please be polite, objective, constructive, and helpful, making sure your critiques are substantiated with facts or with suggestions on possible improvements. Please include comments to the author to support your ratings and recommendations, without identifying yourself. Use a professional style in preparing your comments. If you are recommending mandatory changes, please be clear as to what should be done to make the paper acceptable. Avoid disparaging interjections, ad hominem remarks, and offensive exclamations. Always talk about the paper, not the author. Scrutinize the issues, ideas and methods, not the author. Your review should reflect your scholarly judgment and expertise. Be consistent; do not write a very promising set of comments to the author, and then say very negative things in the evaluation form you provide to the editor (or *vice versa*).

Timeliness in reviewing is essential

Please try to meet the deadlines given for reviews. If you cannot meet the deadline, please let the editor know when to expect your review.

Disclose potential conflicts of interest

We hope for a double-blind review process, but, occasionally, scholars recognize others' work. If you think you cannot give an impartial review, of course you should disqualify yourself. If you think that recognizing the author's work will not prevent you from giving an impartial review, notify the editor who asked you to do the review of the potential appearance of conflict of interest.

Report suspected plagiarism or other breach of ethics

The reviewer has the unpleasant but important responsibility of reporting suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, or ethical concerns about the use of animals or humans in the research being reported. Although we do check submitted papers against a database of published articles, but if you notice plagiarism or other breaches of ethics during your review, please inform the editor.

Disclose limitations

If you are uncertain about some aspects of a manuscript or think certain aspects of a manuscript are outside your expertise, please let the editor know.

Manuscripts should be considered confidential

All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party. If you would like to discuss the article with a colleague, please ask the editor first. Please do not contact the author directly.

Content (novelty), quality and originality

Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to deserve publication? Does it add to the tenet of knowledge? Does the article adhere to the journal's standards? Is the research question an important one? In order to determine its originality and suitability for the journal, it might be helpful to think of the research in terms of what percentile it is in? Is it in the top 50% of papers in this field? You might wish to do a quick literature search using tools such as Medline, PubMed or Scopus to see if there are any reviews of the area. If the research has been covered previously, pass on references of those works to the editor.

Organization and Clarity

Title:

Does it clearly describe the article? Does the Title conform to specifications/instruction to authors?

Abstract:

Does it reflect the content of the article?

Introduction:

Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated? Normally, the introduction should summarize relevant research to provide context, and explain what other authors' findings, if any, are being challenged or extended. It should describe the experiment, the hypothesis(es) and objective.

Method:

Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected? Is the design suitable for answering the question posed? Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these ordered in an expressive and meaningful way? If the methods are new, are they explained in detail? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the equipment and materials been adequately described? Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?

Results:

This is where the author should explain in words what he/she discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. You will need to consider if the appropriate analysis has been conducted. Are the statistics correct? If you are not comfortable with statistics, please advise the editor when you submit your report. Interpretation of results should not be included in this section.

Discussion/Conclusion:

Are the prerogatives and claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?

Tables, Figures, Images:

Are they appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand? Are they crisp and concise?

Legends to Tables and Figure:

Should have been explained properly so that the readers do not have to refer back to the text.