GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

Advanced Research in Life Sciences is a Scientific Journal with high quality standards, which publishes research articles, short communications, review article and case studies in life sciences.

Advanced Research in Life Sciences is an open access and semestrially reviewed journal. The purpose of the journal is to provide a space for the dissemination of new ideas, research and innovation in life sciences. The ARLS journal aims to promote interdisciplinary studies in the field of agriculture, veterinary medicine, animal husbandry, food processing products, agricultural management and bio - technologies.

The journal publishes research papers in the all the fields of life sciences stated below: agriculture, horticulture, soil science, landscaping, farm management, gardening, natural resources power, environmental sciences, ecosystems, agro industry, sustainable environmental, water resource analysis, ecology, climate change, waste management, land surveying, biology, animal science, veterinary medicine, agricultural economics and agro-tourism.

1. Accepting the invitation to review

Reviewers will receive an invitation to review a manuscript via email. The email will contain the title and abstract of the manuscript. Before accepting the invitation to review, reviewers will consider the following questions:

- Does the research area of the manuscript correspond with their research area?
- Do the reviewers encounter a potential conflict of interest?

It is known that reviewing can be a lot of work. The reviewers will confirm that they accept the review process in short time. If the reviewers are unable to complete the review, they will decline the invitation so the editor can invite another reviewer. If the reviewers do not respond to the email within 5 days, they will automatically be uninvited so the Editor can expedite the review process. If the reviewers have questions about the review process, they should contact the Editorial Team.

2. Review process

If the reviewers accept to review the manuscript, the Editor will immediately send them the full manuscript and Manuscript Evaluation Form by email.
The period for review is generally **15 days** from the date the reviewers receive the full manuscript.

The reviewer has the obligation to fill out the report form and to place the article in one of the 4 levels of paper qualification for publication. To facilitate the creation of a global overview regarding the article, the peer reviewer will fill out the attached Manuscript Evaluation Form.

The reviewers evaluate the article following an instruction guide of peer-review, presented below, which contains 11 chapters essential for the achievement of a high scientific level.

For a good review process, the reviewers must carefully fill in the Manuscript Evaluation Form, taking into account the main criteria:

- The article is original, actual and significant for the field
- The title is clear, adequate to the content and corresponds to the topics of the journal
- The abstract clearly presents the content of the paper
- Key words are representative words, adequately used and no more than five
- The introduction includes the problems and research existing in the field
- Scientific methods are correctly described and adequately used
- The results are clear and present the studied problem correctly. Discussions summarize the results well and the result interpretation is in correlation with other studies
- Conclusions are logical, present the main ideas and are derived from the data presented
- References are properly chosen, contain recent publications and are correctly cited
- Terminology is adequate to the subject of the paper
- Tables, charts and pictures are necessary and clear

3. **Review Report**

The objective review of reviewers will help the editorial team decide whether or not to publish the manuscript. The reviewers should note that it is essential to send the Editor their opinion and general observations of the scientific paper. The reviewers’ comments should be constructive, objective and should not include any personal remarks or personal details such as their name.
4. Recommendation

After the reviewing process, the reviewers must make their recommendation for the paper to qualify:

- Accepted in the present form
- Accepted after minor revision (the revisions that are required should be indicated)
- Accepted after major revision (the revisions that are required should be indicated)
- Rejected (explain reason in Report)

5. Comments for Authors

In this chapter the reviewers can send the author a few remarks to improve their manuscript. The reviewers should not opine here about whether the manuscript should be accepted or rejected – such remarks should be confined to the “Confidential Comments to the Editor”.

6. Confidential Comments to the Editor

These comments are seen only by the Editor and Editorial Office and are not shared with authors or other reviewers.