REVIEWER’S GUIDELINES

About the Reviewers

Mass Communicator has a panel of experts on its Board of Reviewers, who evaluate research contributions in different areas of media and communication. They are responsible for maintaining the reliability, validity and quality of research contribution of authors through effective blind peer-review process. The whole process depends on the trust and involvement of the participating reviewers. We appreciate the contribution of reviewers in terms of their valuable comments and suggestions adding value to the research papers.

Check List for the Reviewers

Reviewer(s) review the manuscripts sent to them on the basis of the following parameters:

1. The reviewers shall verify whether all key sections have been covered in the manuscript: Abstract, Review of Literature, Research Design and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion.
2. **Title of the Manuscript**: Whether the title describes the content of the research and it has been phrased briefly.
3. **Originality**: Is the paper, according to the reviewer, original? Does it provide some new information to justify that it is of standard publishable quality?
4. **Review of Literature**: Has the author of the paper provided explanation of work conducted in the relevant research area? Have gaps in literature been identified? Has the author explained the reason why he/she has undertaken the present research?
5. **Research Design and Methods**: The reviewer needs to evaluate whether the author has clearly explained the reasons for the choice of the research design and methods for the study.
6. **Results and Discussion**: The reviewers need to evaluate whether the findings of the study have been presented with logical consistency and coherence. They also need to see if the findings have been interpreted critically in the light of the theoretical framework of the study.
7. **Conclusion**: The reviewers will also analyse if the conclusions drawn are consistent with the findings of the study.
8. **Tables and Graphs**: The reviewers will also see if the tables and graphs given in the study are in accordance with the data discussed in the running text.
9. **References**: The reviewers will also check if the authors have followed the APA Style for references.
10. **Accept/Reject/Minor Revision/Major Revision** is clearly provided by the reviewer with the reasons. In case of revision the parameters and sections are clearly mentioned.
Reviewers’ Final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of the manuscript should be in one of the three categories:

- Rejected due to poor quality, or out of the scope of the journal;
- Accepted without revision;
- Accepted with revision (either major or minor).

In the case of, “accepted with revision category”, reviewers need to clearly identify and highlight what revision is required to the editor and as well as provide their acceptance for further reviewing the same manuscript.