Peer Review Policy

Selection of reviewers

Finding an appropriate reviewer is a demanding task in the publication process. Different factors should be considered 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.

Selection of reviewers should be based on interests, expertise, experience of reviewing, previous performance and conflict of interest.

Green valley Journal highly recommends diversification of reviewers in terms of expertise, demography, gender, etc.

Authors do not have any say in reviewers' selection and reviewer should be anonymous to authors.

Reviewers will be contacted by editor-in-chief

- ✓ He/she inform them they been selected to review an article
- ✓ briefing them the objective and editorial policies of the journal.
- ✓ He/she informs the deadlines and schedules.
- ✓ Persuade them to accept the responsibility.

Review process

Manuscripts submitted to the **Green Valley Journal** are approved by the Editor-in-chief followed by a formal peer review process conducted in collaboration with editorial board members and independent referees. The **Journal** mandates the authors and reviewers to use the **electronic submission and peer-review system.**

Manuscript submitted to the **Green Valley Journal** 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, they are assigned to a member of the Editorial Board (or an expert who is not a member of the Board) for conducting the peer-review process and for making a decision to accept, invite revision of, or reject the article. guidelines for reviewers can be accessed **here**. Only reviewers can access this with password

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 supplied 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. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
- If the manuscript is prepared according to the journal's guidelines.
- Originality of the manuscript
- Plagiarism concern

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

Green Valley Journal of sciences 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.