

Future Social Science Journal (FJSS)

Guidelines for Reviewers

Responsibility of the Reviewer:

A reviewer in the peer reviewing process has the responsibility to provide a coherent critical analysis of the manuscript assigned to her/him, in order to assist in the decision-making process conducted by the editors of the journal in publishing high-quality and profound research. In accepting the task of the double-blinded review of a manuscript, the reviewer is required to respond as soon as possible (either accepting or rejecting to review the manuscript), as well as providing the review in a timely manner. Late posting of reviews will cause undesirable prolonging of the publication process of the issue and the journal. While conducting the review of the manuscript assigned, the reviewer must also be familiar with the policies and ethics guidelines of FJSS.

First Things to Consider Before Reviewing:

In the case of accepting the invitation to review a manuscript, there are several issues you must consider before writing the review:

1. Is this paper within your field of specialization? (if not then you must inform the editors of FJSS immediately for time management and re-assignment purposes)
2. Is there any form of conflict of interest you are suspecting?
3. Does the reviewing schedule suit your schedule? Will you be able to deliver the review exactly on time?
4. Have you familiarized yourself with FJSS' aims and scopes, and policy and ethics guidelines? (find them as downloadable links on our homepage panel).

For further questions on the reviewing process before you begin, please contact the editors on fjss@fue.edu.eg

Reviewing Steps (components to be covered):

The process of reviewing a manuscript aims at critically observing the work submitted for publication, and whether or not it is suitable for moving on to the publication process. The critical observation of your assigned manuscript should cover a review on the following elements:

1. Read the whole manuscript thoroughly for the first time
2. Check for the following:
 - a. The originality of the research paper (does it have an edge and a clear contribution in its field?)
 - b. The overall title of the manuscript (does the title make sense and it is clear with respect to the abstract and keywords chosen by the author(s)?)
 - c. Methodology (has the research adopted/created a methodological suggestion and toolkit that has been applied throughout the research in ways seen as innovative and interdisciplinary?)
 - d. Abstract and keywords (does it comply with the heading of the research paper and the adopted research question, methodology and results?)
 - e. Introduction (are the research problem, research question and sub-questions, as well as aims of the research and purpose clear for the reader and proven throughout the research?)
 - f. State of the art (has the researcher provided a comprehensive state of the art with respect to the chosen topic? Does it show the gap the researcher is trying to fill through the submitted manuscript?)
 - g. Results (are the results, findings clear and have they been addressed and analysed by the author? Do they refer back to the research questions and central concepts used since the introduction of the research?)
 - h. Analysis and Discussions/Justifications
 - i. Tables/images (visual aid and more)
 - j. References/citation/bibliography
3. Your recommendations:
 - a. Rejected (provide your justifications for this decision)
 - b. Accepted (provide your justifications for this decision)
 - c. Accepted conditioned with changes (provide your justification for this decision and the conditions)

Important to Note:

1. Please make sure you have thoroughly read the policies and ethical guidelines of FJSS;
2. Are there any ethical issues related to the manuscript you believe pose a problem to the outcomes and/or the methods the research has adopted to perform is data collection and analysis? If yes, please urgently inform the FJSS editors, as this will discredit the proposed manuscript;
3. Have funding institutions, joint collaborations for data collections and the like been mentioned by the author(s) in the footnotes or the text? (for ethical purposes);
4. Confidentiality of the document and its attachments/appendices, even after the review has been submitted to the editors, in accordance to the ethical guidelines of FJSS;
5. In order to start writing your review, follow the instructions found on our system for reviewers' feedback sent to you per email by clicking on the link in the email.
6. Please make sure that the email FJSS contacted you on to invite you for reviewing, is the same email used to create an account on the system for the reviewing process. This is the only way your reviewing submission can be completed successfully, since the system will otherwise be unable to associate your name to the email initially used to invite you for the review.
7. For the sake of speeding up the process of the double-blind peer-reviewing followed by FJSS, we highly recommend that you stick to the dedicated time given for the reviewing process to take place.
8. Reviewing under Covid-19: We at FJSS are fully aware of the challenges enforced on all of us through the Covid-19 pandemic. We therefore urge you to contact us as soon as you believe you will not be able to submit your review on time, so we can discuss alternative solutions both suitable to the reviewer and to the reviewing process.
9. For any further questions or clarifications needed, do not hesitate to contact the editorial office per email on fjss@fue.edu.eg.