

## **The Review Policy and the Process**

Journal of Society of Anesthesiologists of Nepal (JSAN) makes every effort to complete the peer review process and notify the corresponding author as soon as possible after receiving a complete submission. All articles are evaluated by at least two editors. Selected manuscripts undergo further review, typically by 2-4 peer reviewers. Manuscripts are assessed based on their originality, importance of results, clarity of discussion, contribution of new knowledge, and potential impact on health, health care, policy, and future inquiry.

In addition to the authors who submit a manuscript for publication, the Editor-in-Chief, Executive editor, Editorial Board Members, Reviewers, and Managing Editor all have important roles in the review process. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the entire content of the journal. The Executive Editor and another member of editorial board serve as “Action Editors” for the manuscripts. They select Peer Reviewers, make decisions to reject or encourage revisions, and write the decision letters. Action Editors also recommend articles for publication to the Editor-in-Chief, who then makes the decision regarding publication. Editorial Board Members, who are selected by the Executive Editor to provide expertise across the full range of topics covered by the journal, serve as editorial reviewers,

who will assess the manuscripts. The Executive Editor works with the Editor-in-Chief to coordinate the review process (e.g., communications with authors and editors to ensure adherence to journal guidelines and to promote timely feedback on submitted manuscripts) and to manage the publication process once a manuscript is accepted. Once a manuscript is officially submitted online, it goes through a series of steps before it is sent to a reviewer. First, each submission is reviewed by the Executive Editor to ensure that it complies with the journal's instructions to authors (see [http://sannepal.org/administrator/uploads/pdf/docs\\_4.pdf](http://sannepal.org/administrator/uploads/pdf/docs_4.pdf)). If it does, a determination must then be made as to whether the paper is consistent with the aims and scope of the journal and whether the findings make a sufficient contribution to the existing literature. This decision is made by the Executive Editor, typically in consultation with another member of the editorial board, and is designed to provide rapid feedback for papers that might be best suited for a different publication outlet. For papers that are deemed appropriate, the Executive Editor assigns the manuscript to a member of the editorial board, based on areas of expertise and editor availability, or handles the manuscript personally. At this stage, the assigned editor becomes an Action Editor who enlists reviewers and ultimately evaluates the manuscript based on her/his own reading of the

paper and the reviewers' feedback. Reviewers are selected on the basis of a number of factors such as expertise in the area of research, availability, and prior history of providing timely and quality feedback to authors. Action Editors attempt not to overburden reviewers, particularly experts who frequently review for the journal. As such, when making reviewer selections, Action Editors may consider how recently one has conducted a review for JSAN and if recent review invitations have been declined. JSAN keeps an electronic database of individuals who have previously reviewed for the journal, as well as names of individuals who would be good reviewers along with their areas of expertise. The Action Editor can select from this database or in an online system to search for similar articles to ensure that the reviewers have the appropriate expertise. Occasionally, authors suggest potential reviewers (providing a rationale for why these individuals are experts on the topic), but it is left to the discretion of the Action Editors whether to recruit these individuals to review the manuscript. The e-mailed invitation to review identifies the journal and provides the submission title, abstract, and date when the review is requested (e.g., "within 15 days").

The Journal uses a double blind review process. The invitation to the peer reviewer, like the manuscript itself, does not identify the authors or the authors' institution(s). Neither the author will know about the peer reviewer. Once the

Action Editor has identified at least two, but ideally three, reviewers who have agreed to handle the assignment, s/he is responsible for monitoring the progress of the reviews and issuing a decision letter once a sufficient number of reviews have been received.

The Action Editor issues one of four decision letters:

1. "rejection,"
2. a request for "major revisions,"
3. a request for "minor revisions," or
4. "initial acceptance, pending editor approval."

Authors who receive either a "major revisions" or "minor revisions" letter have 30 days to provide a revised version of their manuscript. Although these latter two decisions provide no guarantee that the paper ultimately will be published, a request for "minor revisions" indicates that the Action Editor is satisfied with major aspects of the study design, method, analysis, and interpretation and is requesting either minor additions or points of clarification to enhance the final product. In contrast, a request for "major revisions" indicates that the Action Editor has significant concerns about some aspect(s) of the study design, method, analysis, and/or interpretation but also believes

that the paper is likely to make a significant contribution to the literature if the identified limitations can be addressed adequately. A manuscript may be circulated for review following initial screening but ultimately receive an editorial decision of “reject,” along with a recommendation that the author(s) consider submitting the paper to a different journal.

Revised submissions go through the same initial steps outlined above for new submissions before they can be reassigned to the original Action Editor. The Action Editor has the option of acting on the revised submission without input from reviewers or sending the paper out for review. Typically, papers that require “major revisions” will be sent back to one or more of the original reviewers to get their opinion regarding the quality of the revised manuscript. On rare occasions, such as when an original reviewer is no longer available, a revised submission may be sent to a new reviewer. Papers that were previously issued a “minor revisions” letter may or may not go back to the reviewers based on the Action Editor’s assessment of the revised submission. The Action Editor sends an “initial acceptance, pending editor approval” letter to the executive editor and the paper undergoes final review. It is then forwarded to the Editor-in-Chief. Once they are satisfied that the manuscript is ready to be published, the Editor-in-Chief issues the final acceptance letter.

The review phase is then officially over, and the manuscript enters the production phase. The next communication that the corresponding author receives will come from the production team, and it will include a “proof” version of the manuscript, which the author(s) must review and approve for accuracy before the article is added to the table of contents for a future issue. The purpose of the proof is to check for errors and the completeness and accuracy of the text, tables, and figures. Substantial changes in content (e.g., new results, corrected values, title, or authorship modifications) are not allowed without the approval of the Editor-in-Chief. It is extremely important that the author(s) conduct a careful review of the manuscript proof, as changes cannot be made after the proof is approved.