



Reviewers Guideline

Overview

HiLCoE Journal of Computer Science and Technology is a peer reviewed journal. Papers will be peer-reviewed by at least two reviewers who are active researchers in the respective area of the paper under consideration. This guide outlines key issues related to the review request, conducting review and communicating the result.

On Being Asked to Review

Please consider the following key points regarding a request you received to review an article/paper.

- ***Does the article you are being asked to review truly match your expertise?***
- ***Do you have time to review the paper?***
- ***Are there any potential conflicts of interest?***

Your answer to the above questions will guide you through your decision of accepting or refusing the review request.

Conducting the Review

HiLCoE Journal of Computer Science and Technology takes article/paper review task professionally and responsibly. Reviewing needs to be conducted using the template indicated below and confidentially. The article you have been asked to review should not be disclosed to a third party. You should not attempt to contact the author. Be aware when you submit your review that any recommendations you make will contribute to the final decision made by the editor.

Communicating Your Report to the Editor

Once you have completed your evaluation of the article the next step is to submit the result to the editor in chief through the journal's website. The report should contain the key elements of your review, addressing the points outlined in the template. Commentary should be courteous and constructive, and should not include any personal remarks or personal details including your name.

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.

Article Review Template

PART 1: Declaration of Competing Interest of the reviewer:	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript? Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare you can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"	
PART 2: Ethical issues . Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? (If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues in details) . If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	
PART 3: <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	
	Reviewer's comment (for the authors)
1. Is the manuscript relevant for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Research Methodology - Do you think the manuscript is methodologically logical? 5. Quality of Paper Organization - Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 6. Technical soundness: Is technical information presented in the paper interesting in terms of scientific quality 7. Result/Contribution- Is the paper making any contribution?	



8. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.

(Apart from above mentioned 8 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)

PART 4: Overall (Objective) Evaluation and rating

Guide	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (9-10) Accept with Minor Revision: (7-8) Accept with Major Revision: (5-6) Rejected : (0-4)	
Reviewer's confidence in the field (High/Medium/Low)	

Part 5: Information for the Editorial Board: This part will not be communicated to the author(s)

(Please provide any issue or comment you want the editors to be aware about)