A reviewer plays a very important role in improving the quality of the manuscript to be published in the journal. The reviewer should consider himself/herself as the authors’ mentor. Reviewing is a time consuming effort and *Bhutan Sorig Journal* is very grateful for your time and support in shaping the manuscripts for quality publishing.

**Why become a reviewer?**

Your contribution as a reviewer not only helps the authors improve their manuscripts but it also helps you as a researcher in the following ways.

1. You get to read about the latest science before it is out on the public domain.
2. Critical reviewing helps you grow as a researcher and author.
3. Reflecting as reviewer on your CV helps improve your recognition by other scientists in the scientific world.
4. Credit your reviewer work on [ORCID](https://orcid.org/).

**General rule:**

1. Reviews should be conducted fairly and objectively. If the research reported in the manuscript is flawed, criticize the science, not the scientist. Personal criticism is likely to lead an author to ignore useful comments, making your review less useful. Criticisms should be objective and constructive, not merely differences of opinion, and intended to help the author improve his or her paper.
2. You should decline to review manuscripts in which you have conflicts of interest.
3. Respect the confidentiality of the manuscript sent to you. You should not discuss unpublished manuscripts with colleagues or use the information in your own work. If you feel a colleague is more qualified than you to review the paper, do not pass the manuscript on to that person without first requesting permission to do so from the editor. Your review and your recommendation should also be considered confidential.
4. If you choose to remain anonymous, ensure that you avoid comments to the authors that might serve as clues to your identity.

**Comments to the editor:**

Your Comments to the Editor will be submitted to the Managing Editor and the  Editor-in-Chief only. These should include any possible conflicts of interest and other comments, which are addressed only to the editor. Comments and constructive criticism of the manuscript should be placed in the Comments to the Author.

**Comments to the author:**

Your Comments to the Author will be submitted to the Managing Editor, the Editor-in-Chief and the authors.

**Points to remember:**

1. Make your comments as complete and detailed as possible.
2. Express your views clearly with supporting arguments and references as necessary.
3. Include clear opinions about the strengths, weaknesses and relevance of the manuscript, its originality and its importance to the field.
4. If you feel unqualified to address certain aspects of the manuscript, please include a statement to identify these areas.

**Reviewing process:**

Please follow the following process while reviewing and fill in the BSJ Reviewer Form (online).

**Title, Abstract and Key Words**

1. Does the title say what the study is about? You can suggest a new title if not found appropriate.
2. Does the abstract summarize the manuscript effectively?
3. Could someone outside of your specialty understand the abstract?
4. Does it contain all the information? Does it contain unnecessary information?
5. Is there any information, which is not there in the main text?
6. Are the key words appropriate and help the readers locate the article?

**Introduction:**

1. Is the background spelt out clearly so that anyone outside your specialty can understand?
2. Does it accurately describe the current knowledge related to the research question or the hypothesis?
3. Does the information contain unnecessary information? Does the introduction require additional current information? Does the introduction need to be more concise?
4. Are the aims clearly defined? Are they consistent throughout the manuscript?
5. Are the purposes of the study spelt out?
6. Has the author addressed how to fill in the knowledge gap?
7. Are the references cited necessary or enough? You can suggest additional references if required.

**Methods:**

1. The methods should be clear to indicate how the results were generated.
2. Are the methods appropriate, scientifically sound, current, and described clearly enough that someone else could repeat the work?
3. Was the sample size appropriate and justified?
4. Is the research ethical and have the appropriate approvals/consent been obtained?

**Statistics:**

1. Are appropriate statistical tools used?
2. Are they sufficiently justified and explained?
3. Are statements of significance justified?

**Results and figures:**

1. When results are stated in the text, are they supported by data? Can you verify easily by examining tables and figures?
2. Are all tables and figures necessary, clearly labeled, well designed and readily interpretable? Are footnotes clear? Is information in the tables and figures redundant? Is it repeated in the text?

**Discussion and conclusion:**

1. Are the main findings written first?
2. Do you have difficulty understanding the main findings of the study?
3. Authors should interpret the results and place them in context of previous findings.
4. Has limitations of the research mentioned?
5. Is there a way forward mentioned?
6. Are the conclusions supported by the data presented?
7. Any conflict of interest declared? Acknowledgements and source of funding mentioned?

**References:**

1. Are the references cited the most appropriate to support the manuscript?
2. Are the citations provided supported by the data?
3. Are any key citations missing? You can suggest if missing.

\*\*\* Please also provide comments on possible research or publication misconduct such as:

1. Does the manuscript report data or conclusions already published or in press? If so, please provide details.
2. Has the author plagiarized another publication?
3. Is there any indication that the data have been fabricated or inappropriately manipulated?
4. Has the author declared all relevant competing interests?