

Reviewer's Consent form

If you accept the responsibilities of reviewer, you must treat the materials you receive as confidential documents. This means you can't share them with anyone without prior authorization from the editor. Since peer review is confidential, you also must not share information about the review with anyone without permission from the editors and authors.

First read the article and then take a break from it, giving you time to think. Consider the article from your own perspective. When you sit down to write the review, make sure you know what the journal is looking for, and have a copy of any specific reviewing criteria you need to consider. Moreover, if you want to suggest another review of same manuscript either completely or partially, don't hesitate to mention it clearly.

Review report

For detailed guidance on writing a review, read the Reviewer's form online. There are separate forms for quantitative research and qualitative research.

They are available online. Please visit for details: www.journalofspark.com

Your review will help the editor to decide whether or not to publish the article. Giving your overall opinion and general observations of the article is essential. Your comments should be courteous and constructive, and should not include any discouraging remarks.

Providing insight into any deficiencies is important. You should explain and support your judgment so that both editors and authors are able to fully understand the reasoning behind your comments. You should indicate whether your comments are your own opinion or are reflected by the data.

- Summarize reviewed article in the form of short paragraph in space given at the end of reviewer's form. This shows the editor you have read and understood the research.
- Give your main impressions of the article, including whether it is novel and interesting, whether it has a sufficient impact and adds to the knowledge base.
- Point out any journal-specific points – does it adhere to the journal's standards?
- If you suspect plagiarism, fraud or have other ethical concerns, raise your suspicions with the editor, providing as much detail as possible. Visit [COPE Guidelines](#) for more information.
- Give specific comments and suggestions, including about layout and format, Title, Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Statistical errors, Results, Conclusion/Discussion, language and References.

Your recommendation

When you make a recommendation, it is worth considering the categories the editor most likely uses for classifying the article:

- Reject (explain reason in report)
- Accept without revision
- Revise – either major or minor (explain the revision that is required, and indicate to the editor whether or not you would be happy to review the revised article)

The final decision

The editor ultimately decides whether to accept or reject the article. The editor will weigh all views and may call for a third opinion or ask the author for a revised paper before making a decision.

Reviewer's Consent

I am willingly giving my consent to become a [Reviewer in Journal of Society of Prevention, Advocacy and Research, KEMU](#) Yes

If you are giving consent to become the reviewer, please check the following boxes:

- Do you have a potential [conflict of interest](#) in any research? No
- If yes, then you accept the responsibility to disclose this to the editor when you respond to specific manuscript.

Yes

- Will educate yourself on the blind peer review process

Yes

Review will be possible within 2 weeks

Yes

- You may provide suggestions for alternative reviewers. (optional)

Please submit this form and your resume within one week for further processing at following email.

jspark@kemu.edu.pk

Thank You for your valuable time