

# AL-AMEEN JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

A Peer-Reviewed, Interdisciplinary, Half-Yearly Research Journal  
Published by Al-Ameen Research Foundation, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India  
ISSN: [to be allotted] | Website: [www.alameenresearch.org](http://www.alameenresearch.org)

## PEER REVIEW POLICY

AJIR/POL-05 — Version 1.0 (Draft)

|                        |                                                                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Document Title         | Peer Review Policy                                                        |
| Version                | Draft v1.0                                                                |
| Status                 | Draft — for review and adoption by the Editorial Board and Advisory Board |
| Effective / Issue Date | Proposed from Volume 1, Issue 1 (2026)                                    |
| Approved By            | Editorial Board & Advisory Board                                          |
| Next Review Date       | May – June 2027                                                           |

*Editorial Note: Timelines shown below are indicative and designed to fit within the Journal's half-yearly production cycle. The Editorial Board may adjust these timelines, provided that the overall principle of timely, rigorous, double-blind review is preserved.*

### A. Overview and Guiding Principles

- Al-Ameen Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (“AJIR”) follows a double-blind Peer Review Policy: the Identity of the Author(s) is concealed from the Reviewer(s), and the identity of the Reviewer(s) is concealed from the Author(s), throughout the process.
- AJIR maintains a Roster of Peer Reviewers, drawn from scholars across the disciplines within the Journal's interdisciplinary scope, recruited on a rolling basis as detailed in the “Invitation for Peer Reviewers” document and the “Guidelines for Peer Reviewers.”
- The Review process is designed, as far as practicable, to be completed within [8–10 weeks] of receipt of a manuscript, so as to support the Journal's half-yearly publication schedule (Issue 1: March–August; Issue 2: September–February).

### B. The Review Workflow

The stages of the Review process, and the indicative responsibility and timeline for each, are summarised below.

| Stage | Action                                                                                                                                                                | Responsibility          | Indicative Time                      |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1     | Manuscript received and acknowledged to the corresponding author.                                                                                                     | Managing Editor         | Within 3 working days                |
| 2     | Initial Editorial screening for scope, format, and completeness (title page, abstract, Declaration by Authors, etc.).                                                 | Managing Editor         | Within 1 week                        |
| 3     | Similarity/plagiarism check. If the manuscript fails the check, it is returned to the author(s) or rejected, per the Ethics Policy.                                   | Managing Editor         | Within 1 week                        |
| 4     | Manuscript anonymised (identifying details removed) to prepare it for Double-Blind Review.                                                                            | Managing Editor         | Within 2–3 days                      |
| 5     | Manuscript assigned to one or two Reviewers from the Roster of Peer Reviewers, matched by subject expertise, or to an adhoc reviewer if no roster match is available. | Editor-in-Chief         | Within 1 week                        |
| 6     | Reviewer(s) complete the review and submit the Peer Review Report using the Journal's template.                                                                       | Reviewer(s)             | Within 3–4 weeks                     |
| 7     | Editorial decision — Accept / Accept with Revisions / Reject — is made based on the Review Report(s).                                                                 | Editor-in-Chief         | Within 1 week of receiving report(s) |
| 8     | Decision and Reviewer feedback (Section A of the report) communicated to the Author(s); if revisions are required, a deadline for Resubmission is specified.          | Managing Editor         | Within 3 working days of decision    |
| 9     | When the Required & Revised manuscript is resubmitted and, if necessary, Re-reviewed by the same Reviewer(s) for confirmation that concerns have been addressed.      | Author(s) / Reviewer(s) | As per agreed timeline               |
| 10    | On Final Acceptance, the manuscript proceeds to copy Editing, Author Proofing, and Typesetting for Inclusion in the forthcoming Half-Yearly issue.                    | Managing Editor         | Per production schedule              |

## C. Reviewer Assignment and Conflicts of Interest

1. Upon receipt of a Manuscript that has cleared initial screening and the similarity check, the Managing Editor removes all identifying details from the manuscript and the file metadata to prepare it for Blind Review.
2. The Manuscript is then assigned to one or, ordinarily, two Reviewer(s) selected for the goodness of fit between their subject expertise and the disciplinary focus of the Manuscript. Where no suitable Reviewer is available on the Roster, the Editor-in-Chief identifies and approaches a suitable Scholar on an adhoc basis.
3. Before Accepting an assignment, a prospective Reviewer must declare any Conflict of Interest — for example, a close professional or personal relationship with an author whose identity can reasonably be inferred, a recent collaboration, or a competing interest in the subject matter — and the Editor-in-Chief shall decide whether to proceed with that Reviewer or not.
4. Where Reviewers Disagree significantly in their Recommendations, or where a Report raises concerns the Editor-in-Chief cannot resolve, an additional reviewer may be approached, or the matter referred to the Editorial Board for Guidance.

## D. Review Report and Evaluation Criteria

1. Reviewers record their Assessment using the Journal's Peer Review Report Template, which requires the Reviewer to score the Manuscript across nine (9) parameters — Introduction; Literature Review; Methodology & Quality of Research; Support of Thesis & Analysis; Conclusion; Research Ethics; Language & Grammar; Style & Referencing (APA); and Citations & References — for a maximum aggregate of 100 points, as set out in the Peer Review Report Template.
2. A Manuscript scoring an aggregate of 60 points or more is generally considered to meet the threshold for Acceptance (with or without revisions); however, the Final decision rests with the Editor-in-Chief, who may also weigh the Reviewer's qualitative comments, ethical considerations, and the Journal's scope.
3. Each Reviewer additionally records the specific strengths and weaknesses of the Manuscript (Section A, shared with the author), any confidential Observations for the Editor (Section B, not shared with the author), and a Final recommendation — (i) Accepted for Publication as is; (ii) Accepted for publication subject to Revision and Re-submission; or (iii) Rejected (Section C).

## E. Confidentiality

1. No identifying information about the Reviewer is disclosed to the Author, and no identifying information about the Author is disclosed to the Reviewer, at any stage of the process, including after Publication.
2. Reviewers must keep the Manuscript and all details of the Review Confidential, must not use any part of the unpublished work for their own purposes, and must not involve any other

person in the Review without the prior knowledge and consent of the Editor-in-Chief, as set out in the Guidelines for Peer Reviewers.

3. Confidentiality may be set aside only where a Legal requirement compels disclosure, or where disclosure is necessary to investigate a credible allegation of Research or Publication misconduct, in line with COPE guidance.

## **F. Decisions and Appeals**

1. The Editorial decision communicated to the Author, based on the Review report(s) and the Editor-in-Chief's assessment, is final in the ordinary course.
2. Where an Author believes there is a genuine and substantial ground for Grievance against an Editorial decision, the matter shall be dealt with under the Complaints and Appeals procedure set out in the Ethics Policy.