

### PEER REVIEW POLICY STATEMENT

1. **Peer-review process:** The manuscripts published in the IJE are subjected to peer-review through obtaining advice on individual manuscripts from reviewers/ experts in the relevant field of Entomology, in addition to by the subject/ section editors as described in the ESI website [www.entosocindia.org](http://www.entosocindia.org)-URL- <http://www.entosocindia.org/instructions-to-authors.html>; = also See URL- <http://www.entosocindia.org/executive-committee-.html>; <http://www.entosocindia.org/ije-editorial-board-.html>; <http://www.entosocindia.org/chief-editor-profile---publications.html>. As stated under Duties/ Responsibilities of EAB/ Reviewers, judgements made are objective, with requirements of reviewers filling up a prescribed manuscript proforma review format; reviewers have no conflict of interest; and it is informed that reviewers should point out relevant published work which is not yet cited, and the reviewed manuscripts are to be treated confidentially. All published articles in Journal must subscribe to rigorous peer review process based on initial editor screening and anonymized refereeing by three referees. The objective is to assure research/ review quality, sustain the originality and quality of research work and filtration of poor quality and plagiarized articles.

The “peer review process” involves the following

- The author/s write/s a research/ review manuscript and submits it adhering to/ following the INSTRUCTIONS covered above.
- The Chief Editor does the initial screening (includes plagiarism check) and forwards it to the Reviewers after due consultations with the Chairman, Editorial Advisory Board (EAB)/ Section/ Subject Editors
- Reviewers review the manuscript according to the guidelines provided and verify the quality of research/ review following a proforma of review format
- The article is returned to the Chief Editor along with a recommendation to either reject the article, revise it or accept it.
- The Editor drafts a decision to be sent to the Author with due consultations of the Section/ Subject Editor/ Chairman, EAB.
- The article is returned to the Author along with the reviewer’s feedback
- The Editor receives the updated article, it is vetted by the Chairman, EAB/ Chief Editor and send it to the Production Unit for Publication
- Reviewers are asked to evaluate the manuscript following guidelines/ checklist as given in the proforma of review format. This format includes columns on material, methods, presentation, details of references to previous relevant work etc. Reviewers provide comments following the guidelines/ checklist, and suggest revisions/ corrections along with specific recommendations.
- Reviewers conclude the proforma with recommendations on acceptance/ minor revisions/ major revisions/ rejections and advice on whether or not the manuscript to be published. This whole process is done within 4-6 weeks as given above.
- The final decision on the “peer review process’ is conveyed to the authors within this time. Recommendations made by the reviewers, with verbatim comments are conveyed in this final decision.
- Revised manuscripts are usually sought from authors within 3-4 weeks. The Chief Editor solicits further advice from the Section/ Subject Editors / Reviewers, if required within 1-2 weeks. This process may demand more than one revision of a manuscript.
- Special Issues / Conference Proceedings will have almost similar peer review procedures with slight modifications.
- Chief Editor's Decision is final in all the above, and reserves the right in all decisions/ actions.

2. **Editorial decisions:** These decisions are based on peer review. The reviewers are expected to maintain absolute confidentiality with regard to the contents of manuscripts. The reviews are conducted objectively and the referees are expected to express their views clearly with supporting reasons. The reviewers should have no conflict of interest with the authors and the subject matter of the research. The reviewers are required to identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any observation or argument which has been previously reported should also be accompanied along with the relevant citation. Similarities or overlaps between the manuscript under review and any other published paper of which the reviewer may have personal knowledge, may also be brought to the attention of the members of the EAB. The information or ideas obtained through peer review are of a privileged nature and these are kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers are informed not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative or other relationship with any of authors or institutions connected to the manuscript.

3. **Editor's responsibilities:** The Editorial Team of the ESI/IJE, comprising the Editorial Advisory Board (EAB) for Publications is responsible for taking a decision as to which of the manuscripts submitted to the IJE are to be published. The members of the EAB have complete discretion to reject/accept a manuscript. The EAB may confer/deliberate with other reviewers/members in arriving at its decisions. The evaluation of manuscripts is made on the basis of their scholarly and intellectual content without having regard to the nature of the authors or the institution including gender, race, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors. The IJE follows a policy of fair play in its editorial evaluation. The editors are expected to exercise caution and ensure that they have no conflict of interest with respect to the manuscripts they accept/ reject. The members of the EAB follow strict confidentiality and are required not to disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers and the ESI. Authors are encouraged to correct the errors which are found during the process of review while preserving the anonymity of the reviewers.

4. **Duties/ Responsibilities of EAB/ Reviewers:** The EAB and the Chief Editor follow "Peer Review Policy" of the Journal. This Policy ensures the practice of publishing only good science. It is supported by an objective process at the heart of publishing as carried out by all reputed scientific journals. Reviewers play a vital role in maintaining the high standards of the Journal. All manuscripts are peer reviewed following the "peer review process" given above. It is the responsibility of the Chief Editor to convey the decision of the "peer review" within 4-6 weeks. Peer Review follows the "peer review process" given above employing single blind review, where the reviewer remains anonymous to the authors throughout the process. Reviewers are matched to the manuscript according to their expertise as advised by the Section/ Subject Editors. The Section/ Subject Editors/ Chief Editor hold a reviewer database containing reviewer contact details together with their subject areas of interest, and this is constantly being updated.

5. **Publication process:** Article submissions must adhere to the INSTRUCTIONS. Authors are required to peruse the publication ethics/ essential requirements given under the "Ethics and malpractice statement" of the Journal. This statement covers details about the publisher, nature of manuscripts published, EAB, executive committee, duties and responsibilities of Chief Editor/ EAB/ Reviewers and Authors, Peer Review process, Publication ethics, Copyright access, Archiving, Principles of transparency, Best practices, Ownership and such aspects of Journal publishing. This statement is published in every issue and also available in the website of the Society. Submissions are acknowledged/ processed with the understanding that authors subscribe to the ethics/ requirements by default. Articles not adhering to the above are liable to be rejected.