

Reviewer Guidelines

Journal of Computing and Numerical Sciences (JCNS)

The *Journal of Computing and Numerical Sciences (JCNS)* relies on the expertise, objectivity, and integrity of its reviewers to maintain the highest standards of scholarly publishing. Reviewers play a critical role in evaluating the originality, technical quality, and scientific significance of submitted manuscripts.

1. Reviewer Responsibilities

1.1 Double-Blind Peer Review

JCNS follows a **double-blind peer-review process** in which the identities of both authors and reviewers remain confidential throughout the review process. This ensures an independent, impartial, and unbiased evaluation of submitted manuscripts.

1.2 Confidentiality

Reviewers must treat all manuscripts and associated materials as strictly confidential. Manuscripts under review must not be shared, discussed, or disclosed to any unauthorized person. Reviewers must not use unpublished information, data, or ideas contained in a manuscript for personal research or professional advantage. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools to generate peer-review reports is not permitted unless explicitly authorized by the journal.

1.3 Timeliness

Reviewers are expected to respond promptly to review invitations and submit their evaluations within the agreed timeframe, typically **3–4 weeks**. If a reviewer is unable to complete the review within the specified period, the Editorial Office should be informed as soon as possible.

1.4 Conflict of Interest

Reviewers must disclose any financial, professional, institutional, or personal relationships that could influence their judgment. Reviewers with a potential conflict of interest should decline the review invitation and recuse themselves from the review process.

2. Evaluation Criteria

Reviewers should assess manuscripts based on the following criteria:

2.1 Originality and Significance

- Does the manuscript present novel ideas, methodologies, algorithms, or theoretical developments?
- Does it make a meaningful contribution to the fields of computing, numerical analysis, or computational sciences?

2.2 Technical Quality and Methodological Rigor

- Are the mathematical models, algorithms, proofs, and computational methods technically sound?
- Are the numerical experiments, simulations, and analyses appropriate, accurate, and reproducible?
- Are the conclusions supported by the presented results?

2.3 Clarity and Organization

- Is the manuscript logically structured and clearly written?
- Are figures, tables, equations, and references presented appropriately?
- Is the discussion coherent and scientifically sound?

2.4 Literature and References

- Has the relevant literature been adequately reviewed?
- Are references current, relevant, and properly cited?
- Are important prior contributions appropriately acknowledged?

2.5 Constructive Feedback

Review reports should be objective, respectful, and constructive. Comments should provide clear reasoning, specific suggestions, and, where appropriate, references that may assist authors in improving their manuscripts.

2.6 Recommendation

Reviewers should recommend one of the following decisions:

- Accept
- Accept with Minor Revisions
- Major Revisions Required
- Reject