

NIET Journal of Discourse, Technology, and Society (NJDTS)

Peer Review Policy

1. Review Model

NJDTS follows a double-blind peer review process. Author identities are concealed from reviewers, and reviewer identities are concealed from authors throughout the review process.

2. Initial Editorial Screening

All submissions are first assessed by the Editorial Board for scope, originality, and basic quality. Manuscripts that do not meet minimum standards, fall outside the journal's scope, or fail a similarity/plagiarism check may be rejected without external review (desk rejection).

3. Reviewer Selection

Manuscripts that pass initial screening are assigned to a minimum of two independent reviewers with relevant subject expertise. Reviewers with a conflict of interest (institutional, financial, personal, or collaborative ties to the authors) are excluded from the review.

4. Review Process

- Reviewers evaluate manuscripts for originality, methodological soundness, validity of results, clarity, and relevance to the journal's scope.
- Reviewers submit written comments and a recommendation: Accept, Minor Revision, Major Revision, or Reject.
- Where reviewer recommendations conflict, the editor may invite an additional reviewer or make the final decision based on the available reports.

5. Timeline

Reviewers are expected to complete their assessment within 3–4 weeks of accepting the invitation. Editors may send reminders or reassign the manuscript if this deadline is not met.

6. Revisions

Authors are given a set period (typically 2–4 weeks) to submit revisions along with a point-by-point response to reviewer comments. Revised manuscripts may be sent back to the original reviewers or evaluated by the editor directly, depending on the extent of changes required.

7. Editorial Decision

The final decision to accept, revise, or reject a manuscript rests with the Editorial Board, informed by reviewer recommendations but not strictly bound by them.

8. Confidentiality

Manuscripts under review are treated as confidential material and must not be shared, discussed, or used by reviewers for personal benefit.

9. Appeals

Authors who disagree with a rejection decision may submit a written appeal with justification to the Editor-in-Chief, who will consult with an independent editorial board member before issuing a final decision.