

# Peer Review Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers

## Peer Review

The journal undertakes single-blind peer review.

Reviewers are requested to treat the manuscript confidentially.

The Managing Editor's judgment is final with regard to suitability for publication.

## Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers

### Preliminary selection

The Editors will evaluate the research articles before sending them for in-depth review. Manuscripts will be rejected without review:

- 1) that are not written in standard, grammatically correct English or do not have good figure quality
- 2) that do not fall within the Aims and Scope of the journal
- 3) that have not followed the Author Instructions regarding manuscript submission, format and style
- 4) that have been simultaneously submitted elsewhere
- 5) that have been published elsewhere
- 6) that are translations of non-English published work without providing the history of the manuscript and written permission from the original copyright holder [see *Translations* in **Statement of Editorial and Publication Policies** for more detail]
- 7) that contain plagiarized material or other unethical elements (e.g., fabricated data, conflict of interest, etc.)

### General recommendations for authors and reviewers

As well as the points listed above, the following are guidelines that the authors should consider as they prepare their manuscripts for submission. Reviewers should keep these points in mind when reviewing. Chances of rejection of the manuscript are significantly increased if the manuscript:

- 1) lacks structure (introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, etc.)
- 2) lacks environmental monitoring or assessment applications
- 3) lacks analytical quality control
- 4) consists essentially of repetition of already published data/papers, with no new insights
- 5) contains no new science
- 6) does not highlight and explain clearly the new science versus current knowledge
- 7) lacks up-to-date references
- 8) contains theories, concepts, conclusions, etc. that are insufficiently supported by the supplied data, arguments and information
- 9) does not provide enough information to permit repetition of the experimental work
- 10) lacks clear descriptions and explanations of the experimental design, essential sample characteristics and descriptive statistics, hypotheses tested, exact references to the literature describing the tests used in the manuscript, number of data involved in statistical tests, etc.
- 11) contains data coming from an incorrectly designed experiment or the statistical analysis, where needed, that is faulty or insufficient
- 12) contains plagiarized material or other unethical elements (e.g., fabricated data, conflict of interest, etc.)

Authors should also review *Authorship Guidelines*, *Publishing Ethics* and *Manuscript Structure* for more details.

## TIPS!

- *An internet search on the topic 'Avoiding Plagiarism' will result in helpful tutorials from many well-known universities.*
- *Tools like CrossCheck plagiarism software make it easy for journals to identify researchers that engage in unethical behavior. Consider the consequences to your career if you engage in unethical practices.*