KANI JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

1. Purpose of Peer Review

Peer review assists the Kani Journal of Social Sciences in maintaining the scholarly quality, originality, relevance, and integrity of published research. Reviewers are asked to provide an objective, constructive, and evidence-based assessment of submitted manuscripts.

2. Reviewer Responsibilities

Reviewers should:

- Assess manuscripts objectively and independently.
- Evaluate the originality, significance, methodological soundness, and relevance of the research.
- Provide clear, constructive, and professionally expressed comments.
- Identify important weaknesses or areas requiring clarification or improvement.
- Maintain the confidentiality of manuscripts and all related editorial communications.
- Declare any actual or potential conflict of interest.
- Complete reviews within the agreed timeframe or promptly inform the Editorial Office if this is not possible.

3. Confidentiality

Manuscripts submitted for review are confidential documents. Reviewers should not disclose, copy, distribute, or use unpublished information contained in a manuscript for purposes unrelated to the review.

Reviewers should not share manuscripts or review materials with others unless this has been authorised by the Editorial Office.

4. Conduct of the Review

Reviewers should consider:

- Originality and contribution to knowledge
- Relevance to the journal's scope
- Clarity of research objectives
- Appropriateness of the methodology
- Quality of analysis and interpretation
- Whether conclusions are supported by the evidence
- Quality and relevance of the literature

- Clarity and organisation of presentation
- Appropriate use of tables, figures, and supporting material where applicable

5. Reviewer Comments

Comments should be specific, constructive, and respectful. Reviewers should distinguish between major issues that affect the scholarly validity of the manuscript and minor issues such as clarification, presentation, or language.

Personal, discriminatory, offensive, or unnecessarily hostile comments should not be included in a review.

6. Ethical and Research Integrity Concerns

Reviewers should inform the Editorial Office if they identify serious concerns relating to plagiarism, duplicate publication, fabrication, falsification, inappropriate data manipulation, unethical research practices, or other potential breaches of research integrity.

Such concerns should be communicated confidentially and should not be presented as established misconduct unless the evidence supports that conclusion.

7. Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers should disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest that could affect, or reasonably be perceived as affecting, their impartiality.

Where a significant conflict exists, reviewers should decline the review and inform the Editorial Office.

8. Recommendation

Reviewers may recommend:

- **Accept**
- **Minor Revision**
- **Major Revision**
- **Reject**

The recommendation is advisory. The final editorial decision rests with the journal's editors.

9. Reviewer Declaration

By submitting a review, the reviewer confirms that the assessment has been prepared objectively and that any relevant conflict of interest has been disclosed.

Reviewers should complete the journal's **Reviewer Evaluation Form**, **Reviewer Confidentiality Statement**, and **Reviewer Conflict of Interest Declaration** as applicable.