Peer Review Policy of Green Valley Journal of Agriculture (GVJA)

Selection of reviewers

Finding an appropriate reviewer is a demanding task in the publication process. **GVJA** uses multiple criteria to find, select, contact, and persuade scholars to review papers.

Reviewers can be found from references of literatures, research database, board members can be reviewers as well, previous authors and guest editors, personal networks, conferences and congress, and elsewhere.

GVJA Selects reviewers based on interests, expertise, experience of reviewing, previous performance and conflict of interest.

Reviewers will be contacted by editors

Review process

Manuscripts submitted to the **GVJA** are approved by the Editor-in-chief followed by a formal peer review process conducted in collaboration with editorial board members and independent referees.

Manuscript submitted to the **GVJA** passes through a double-blind peer-review process.

The criteria for publication in the journal are as follows

- The study presents the results of primary scholarly research.
- Results reported have not been published elsewhere.
- The research meets all applicable standards of ethics and research integrity.
- Experiments, statistics, and other analyses are performed to a high technical standard and are described in sufficient detail.
- Conclusions are presented in an appropriate fashion and are supported by the data.
- The article is presented in a clear fashion and is written in Standard English.
- Local language articles are evaluated in the above criteria except the language

Once the manuscripts have passed desk review, it will be assigned to a minimum of two reviewers for conducting the peer-review process for making a suggestion to accept, invite revision of, or reject the article based on the reviewers' guideline. The final decision to accept or reject the article is made by editors based on suggestion of reviews.

In case of one reviewer accepts the article and the other rejects, **GVJA** editor make the final decision**.**

When authors believe their article is rejected unfairly, they can submit a formal appeal to **JVGA** editor-in-chief for reconsideration.

Reviewers' responsibility

- Reviewers should read and understand the journal's peer reviewing policy before accepting the role.
- Reviewers should accept manuscripts only they are experts on.
- Reviewers should give timely responses whether they accept or decline the review
- Reviewers should evaluate manuscripts objectively.
- Reviewers should respect the confidentiality of material submitted to them.
- Reviewers should decline the manuscript if they have any conflict of interest with the authors
- Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.
- Reviews should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Accepting to review the manuscript

Reviewers should accept manuscripts only they are expertise on. They should have genuine interest of the subject matter. If they believe they are not fully qualified for the review they can decline or pass to more appropriate reviewer through the consent of editors. They should give timely response whether they accept or decline the review.

Evaluation of manuscript

Reviewers should evaluate manuscripts objectively. Reviewers are recommended to read all component of the manuscript before beginning of evaluation.

Reviewers should see

1. **Originality**

   Evaluator should explicitly analyze if the manuscript Present new findings or incite.

2. **completeness of the manuscript**; - a complete manuscript should contain
   - 1.1. suitable tile
   - 1.2. Comprehensive abstract
   - 1.3. Introduction
   - 1.4. Robust Methods
   - 1.5. Result and discussion
   - 1.6. Conclusion
   - 1.7. Acknowledgements (if any)
   - 1.8. References
   - 1.9. Appendices (optional)
   - 1.10. Supplementary materials (optional)

3. **Well written**

Reviewer should see the manuscript if it is Clear, concise, grammatically correct and use appropriate language for scientific communication.

4. contribution of the work for the scientific and general community.
5. **Completeness**, sufficiency, recentness and consistency of references
6. **Ethical issue in the manuscript**
7. **Competing interest issue**
8. **Plagiarism concern**

Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

Reviewer Misconduct

GVJA Editors will take reviewer misconduct seriously and pursue any allegation of breach of confidentiality, non-declaration of conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay of peer review for competitive advantage. Allegations of serious reviewer misconduct, such as plagiarism, will be taken to the institutional level.