

Reviewer's Guidelines for *Exploration अन्वेषण*

Introduction

Exploration अन्वेषण is a double-blind peer-reviewed multidisciplinary journal published annually by the Research Management Cell, Darchula Multiple Campus, Far Western University, Nepal. The journal publishes research in Education, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Management, maintaining high academic and ethical standards through a rigorous peer-review process.

Role of Reviewers

Reviewers play a vital role in ensuring the quality, originality, and clarity of published work. They provide constructive, unbiased, and timely feedback to assist both the editors and authors in improving manuscripts.

Ethical Responsibilities

Reviewers must observe the following ethical principles:

- Confidentiality: Manuscripts are confidential and must not be shared or discussed with others.
- Impartiality: Reviews should be objective and professional, avoiding personal criticism.
- Conflict of Interest: Reviewers should decline review assignments where a financial, institutional, or personal conflict exists.
- Integrity: Any suspicion of plagiarism, data fabrication, or unethical conduct must be immediately reported to the editor.

Review Process Overview

1. Assignment: Manuscripts are assigned to reviewers based on expertise.
2. Double-Blind Review: Both author and reviewer identities remain anonymous.
3. Review Period: Reviewers are requested to complete reviews within 7 days.
4. Decision Categories:
 - Accept as is
 - Accept with minor revisions
 - Accept with major revisions
 - Reject

Reviewing Method and Format

All reviews must be completed directly in the manuscript (Word file) using the following format:

Use Track Changes:

- Edit or suggest improvements (grammar, clarity, formatting) using the *Track Changes* feature.
- Highlight unclear or inaccurate sections where revision is required.

Use Comments for Specific Feedback:

- Provide specific comments by inserting New Comment option.
- Each comment should identify the issue and offer constructive suggestions for improvement.

Provide Overall Comments at the Top:

- At the beginning of the article, insert a short section titled “Reviewer’s Overall Comments.”
- Summarize the manuscript’s strengths, weaknesses, and overall quality.
- End with a clear recommendation (e.g., Accept, Minor Revision, Major Revision, or Reject).

This system ensures clarity, transparency, and uniformity across all reviews.

Evaluation Criteria

Reviewers are asked to evaluate manuscripts based on the following key aspects:

Section / Criterion	Assessment Focus
Title	Is the title concise (≤ 12 words), informative, and reflective of the content?
Abstract	Does it clearly summarize context, purpose, methods, key findings, and conclusions within 150–250 words?
Keywords	Are 4–6 relevant and searchable keywords provided?
Introduction	Does it present clear background, problem statement, objectives, and significance of the study?
Literature Review / Theoretical Framework	Are the concepts well defined and supported by up-to-date scholarly works?
Methodology	Are research design, methods, participants, tools, and procedures valid, clear, and replicable?
Results	Are results accurately presented, logically organized, and adequately interpreted?
Discussion	Does it meaningfully interpret findings, connect to theory and recent literature, and highlight implications?
Conclusion	Is it consistent with objectives and findings, and does it offer recommendations or implications?

References	Are sources relevant, recent, sufficient (≥ 15 scholarly works), and formatted in APA 7th Edition with DOIs where applicable?
Clarity and Organization	Is the paper coherent, grammatically sound, and well-structured?
Originality and Contribution	Does it provide new insights or advance understanding in its field?
Ethical Compliance	Is the study ethically conducted and plagiarism-free?

Tone and Quality of Feedback

- Be specific, respectful, and constructive.
- Highlight strengths before suggesting improvements.
- Avoid vague comments such as “unclear”, instead, specify what is unclear and suggest a revision.
- Focus on helping authors improve rather than simply criticizing.

Confidential Comments to the Editor

Reviewers may include confidential remarks in a separate section of their email (not in the manuscript) if they need to:

- Raise ethical or conflict-of-interest concerns, or
- Provide additional comments meant only for the editorial board.

Recognition

To acknowledge reviewers’ contributions:

- Reviewers who complete reviews on time and with quality feedback will receive a Certificate of Appreciation if they want.
- Their names with consent will be published in the journal.

Contact Information

Dammar Singh Saud

Editor-in-Chief

Exploration अन्वेषण: A Peer-Reviewed Multidisciplinary Journal

Research Management Cell (RMC)
Darchula Multiple Campus
Far Western University, Nepal

Website: <https://darchula.fwu.edu.np/>

Email: rmcfwudmc@gmail.com

Cell No.: +977-9858750582