**IJICTDC peer-to-peer review process**

**1. Submission of Paper: -** The corresponding or submitting author submits the paper to the journal. These submissions are usually by email.

**2. Editorial Office Assessment: -** The journal checks the paper’s composition and arrangement against the journal’s Author Guidelines to make sure it includes the required sections and stylizations. The quality of the paper is not assessed at this point.

**3. Appraisal by the Editor-in-Chief (EIC): -** The EIC checks that the paper is appropriate for the journal and is sufficiently original and interesting. If not, the paper may be rejected without being reviewed any further.

**4. EIC Assigns a Co-Editor-in-Chief (Co-EIC): -** Co-Editor-in-Chiefhandles the peer review.

**5. Invitation to Reviewers**

The Co-Editor-in-Chiefsends invitations to individuals he or she believes would be appropriate reviewers. As responses are received, further invitations are issued, if necessary, until the required number of acceptances is obtained – commonly this is 2, but there is some variation between journals.

**6. Response to Invitations**

Potential reviewers consider the invitation against their own expertise, conflicts of interest and availability. They then accept or decline. If possible, when declining, they might also suggest alternative reviewers.

**7. Review is Conducted: -** The reviewer sets time aside to read the paper several times. The first read isused to form an initial impression of the work. If major problems are found at this stage, the reviewermay feel comfortable rejecting the paper without further work. Otherwise, they will read the paper several more times, taking notes so as to build a detailed point-by-point review. The review is then submitted to the journal, with a recommendation to accept or reject it – or else with a request for revision (usually flagged as either major or minor) before it is reconsidered.

**8. Journal Evaluates the Reviews: -** The handling editor considers all the returned reviews before making an overall decision. If the reviews differ widely, the editor may invite an additional reviewer so as to get an extra opinion before making a decision.

**9. The Decision is Communicated**

The editor sends a decision email to the author including any relevant reviewer comments. Whether the comments are anonymous or not will depend on the type of peer review that the journal operates.