

## **REVIEWERS' RESPONSIBILITIES**

Reviewers are required to provide written, competent and unbiased feedback in a timely manner on the scholarly merits and the scientific value of the manuscript.

The reviewers assess manuscript for the compliance with the profile of the journal, the relevance of the investigated topic and applied methods, the originality and scientific relevance of information presented in the manuscript, the presentation style and scholarly apparatus.

Reviewers should alert the Editor to any well-founded suspicions or the knowledge of possible violations of ethical standards by the authors. Reviewers should recognize relevant published works that have not been cited by the authors and alert the Editor to substantial similarities between a reviewed manuscript and any manuscript published or under consideration for publication elsewhere, in the event they are aware of such. Reviewers should also alert the Editor to a parallel submission of the same paper to another journal, in the event they are aware of such.

Reviewers must not have conflict of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the funding sources for the research. If such conflicts exist, the reviewers must report them to the Editor without delay.

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the Editor without delay.

Reviews must be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Reviewers must not use unpublished materials disclosed in submitted manuscripts without the express written consent of the authors. The information and ideas presented in submitted manuscripts shall be kept confidential and must not be used for personal gain.

## **PEER REVIEW**

The submitted manuscripts are subject to a peer review process. The purpose of peer review is to assist the Section Editors, Editorial Board and Editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author it may also assist the author in improving the paper.

The peer review is double-blind, and carried out by one reviewer. The period for review of a manuscript is 20 days, from the date of acceptance by reviewer.

The peer reviewing process is on voluntarily basis, and for reviewer is not provided financial support.

The choice of reviewers is at the Section Editors' and Editorial board discretion. The reviewers must be knowledgeable about the subject area of the manuscript; they must not be from the authors' own institution and they should not have recent joint publications with any of the authors.

## **Review process**

In the main review phase, the Section Editors sends submitted papers to one experts in the field. The reviewers' evaluation form contains a checklist in order to help referees cover all aspects that can decide the fate of a submission. In the final section of the evaluation form, the reviewers must include observations and suggestions aimed at improving the submitted manuscript; these are sent to authors, without the names of the reviewers.

All of the reviewers of a manuscript remain anonymous to the authors before, during and after the evaluation process.

All of the reviewers of a manuscript remain anonymous to the authors before, during and after the evaluation process and the authors remain anonymous to reviewers until the end of the review procedure.

Reviewers can enter some observations in a paper in the form of comments. Reviewers after completing the form and upload reviews annexes through the website of the Contemporary Agriculture <http://www.contagri.info/submit-review>.