

Editorial Workflow

The following is the editorial workflow that every manuscript submitted to the e-journal undergoes during the course of the peer-review process.

Once a manuscript is submitted, the manuscript is assigned to an Editor most appropriate to handle it based on the subject of the manuscript and the availability of the Editors. If the Editor determines that the manuscript is not of sufficient quality to go through the normal review process or if the subject of the manuscript is not appropriate to the journal scope, the Editor rejects the manuscript with no further processing.

If the Editor determines that the submitted manuscript is of sufficient quality and falls within the scope of the journal, he/she assigns the manuscript to a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 5 external reviewers for peer-review. The reviewers submit their reports on the manuscripts along with their recommendation of one of the following actions to the Editor –

- ✓ Publish Unaltered
- ✓ Publish after Minor Changes
- ✓ Review Again after Major Changes
- ❖ Reject: Manuscript is flawed or not sufficiently novel

When all reviewers have submitted their reports, the Editor can make one of the following editorial recommendations –

- Publish Unaltered
- Review Again after Minor Changes
- Review Again after Major Changes
- ❖ Reject

If the Editor recommends ‘Publish Unaltered’, the manuscript is accepted for upload.

If the Editor recommends ‘Review Again after Minor Changes’, the authors are notified to prepare and submit a final copy of their manuscript with the required minor changes suggested by the reviewers. Only the Editor, and not the external reviewers, reviews the revised manuscript after the minor changes have been made by the authors. Once the Editor is satisfied with the final manuscript, the manuscript can be accepted.

If the Editor recommends ‘Review Again after Major Changes,’ the recommendation is communicated to the authors. The authors are expected to revise their manuscripts in accordance with the changes recommended by the reviewers and to submit their revised manuscript in a timely manner. Once the revised manuscript is submitted, the original reviewers are contacted with a request to review the revised version of the manuscript. Along with their review reports on the revised manuscript, the reviewers make a recommendation which can be ‘Publish Unaltered’ or ‘Publish after Minor Changes’ or ‘Reject’. The Editor can then make an editorial

recommendation which can be “Publish Unaltered” or “Review Again after Minor Changes” or “Reject.”

If the Editor recommends rejecting the manuscript, the rejection is immediate. Also, if two of the reviewers recommend rejecting the manuscript, the rejection is immediate.

The editorial workflow gives the Editors the authority in rejecting any manuscript because of inappropriateness of its subject, lack of quality, or incorrectness of its results. The Editor cannot assign himself/herself as an external reviewer of the manuscript. This is to ensure a high-quality, fair, and unbiased peer-review process of every manuscript submitted to the journal, since any manuscript must be recommended by one or more (usually two or more) external reviewers along with the Editor in charge of the manuscript in order for it to be accepted for publication in the journal.

The peer-review process is blinded, i.e., the reviewers and the authors of the manuscript are do not have access to the information of who the peer-reviewer and author. Every journal published by JAGRUTI has an preface and acknowledgement page for the contributed scholars and peer-reviewers who have performed the peer-review process for one or more of the manuscripts. Without the significant contributions made by these researchers, the publication of the journal would not be possible.

JAGRUTI

