

Review Policy

Peer review is one of the most important step of the publishing process. It has a fundamental role to play in maintaining the integrity of the published literature and advancing discovery. We are committed to prompt evaluation and publication of fully accepted papers in journals. To maintain a high-quality publication, all submissions undergo a rigorous review process. Characteristics of the peer review process are as follows:

Simultaneous submissions of the same manuscript to different journals is not acceptable

Papers will be refereed by experts as suggested by the editorial board.

All publication decisions are made by the journal's Editors-in-Chief on the basis of the referees' reports. Authors of papers that are not accepted are notified promptly.

All submitted manuscripts are treated as confidential documents. We expect our Board of Reviewing Editors and reviewers to treat manuscripts as confidential material as well.

Editors and reviewers involved in the review process should disclose conflicts of interest resulting from direct competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors, and remove oneself from cases in which such conflicts preclude an objective evaluation.

Our peer review process is confidential and identities of reviewers cannot be revealed.

The authors may contact us for any clarification in our policy.

Publication Procedure

Initial Checks

All submitted manuscripts received by the different journals managed by AIOHP will be checked by Editor-in-Chief to determine whether they are properly prepared according to author instruction. The manuscript will be checked to ascertain that they follow the ethical policies of the journal, including those for human and animal experimentation. Manuscripts that do not fit the journal's ethics policy or do not meet the standards of the journal will be rejected before peer-review. Manuscripts that are not properly prepared will be returned to the authors for revision and resubmission. After these checks, Editor-in-Chief will consult the journals' Editor, Associate Editor, or Advisory Board Member (or an Editorial Board member in case of a conflict of interest) to determine whether the manuscript fits the scope of the journal and whether it is scientifically sound. No judgment on the significance or potential impact of the work will be made at this stage. Reject decisions at this stage will be verified by the Editor-in-Chief.

Peer-Review

Once a manuscript passes the initial checks, it will be assigned to at least two independent subject experts for peer-review. A double blind review is applied where Reviewers' & Authors' identity are not revealed to each other. Only Editor-in-Chief is aware of identity of both.

Potential reviewers suggested by the authors during submission process may also be considered. Reviewers should not have published with any of the co-authors during the past five years and should not currently work or collaborate with any of the institutions of the co-authors of the submitted manuscript.

Editorial Decision and Revision

All the articles, reviews and communications published in journals go through the peer-review process and receive at least two reviews. The Reviewer will communicate the decision to the Editor-in-Chief with following points

Accept after Minor Revisions: The paper is in principle accepted after revision based on the reviewer's comments. Authors are given five days for minor revisions.

Reconsider after Major Revisions: The acceptance of the manuscript would depend on the revisions. The author needs to provide a point by point response or provide a rebuttal if some of the reviewer's comments cannot be revised. Usually, only one round of major revisions is allowed. Authors will be asked to resubmit the revised paper within a suitable time frame, and the revised version will be returned to the reviewer for further comments.

Reject and Encourage Resubmission: If additional experiments are needed to support the conclusions, the manuscript will be rejected and the authors will be encouraged to re-submit the paper once further experiments have been conducted.

Reject: The article has serious flaws, and/or makes no original significant contribution. No offer of resubmission to the journal is provided.

All reviewer comments should be responded to in a point-by-point fashion by Authors. Where the authors disagree with a reviewer, they must provide a clear response.

Author Appeals

Authors may appeal a rejection by sending an e-mail to the Editorial Office of the journal. The appeal must provide a detailed justification, including point-by-point responses to the reviewers' and/or Editor's comments. The Editor-in-Chief will discuss the manuscript and related information with Editorial Board members. The Editorial Board will then give an advisory recommendation on the manuscript and may recommend acceptance, further peer-review, or uphold the original rejection decision. A reject decision at this stage is final and cannot be reversed.

In the case of a special issue, the Managing Editor of the journal will forward the manuscript and related information (including the identities of the referees) to the Editor-in-Chief who will be asked to give an advisory recommendation on the manuscript and may recommend acceptance, further peer-review, or uphold the original rejection decision. A reject decision at this stage will be final and cannot be reversed.

