

## Journal of Apicultural Science

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

#### General Information

The **Journal of Apiculture Science** publishes articles on all aspects of the life of bees (superfamily Apoidea) and apiculture. **Review Articles** provide expert summaries of current knowledge in a particular field. They have no set format but should generally contain an Abstract, Keywords, Acknowledgements, and References. **Original Scientific Articles** report new and substantial contributions to apiculture science based on original research. They have the following format: Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, Acknowledgements, and References.

Reviewers are kindly requested to assess a manuscript's scientific integrity and soundness, as well as its contribution to knowledge in the area. Please be critical but highlight both weak and strong points from the manuscript. This approach will help editors to make a fair assessment of a paper and help authors improve the quality of a manuscript accepted for publication. Therefore, the comments must be justified and convincing.

Your **review** should be submitted using the **Manuscript Editorial System** at [www.editorialsystem.com/jas](http://www.editorialsystem.com/jas). To submit your review, you need to register with the Editorial System of the Journal of Apicultural Science, supplying your data including email and selected password. Your account will be used for future reference. Please follow the instructions displayed on the screen after accessing the website.

Reviewer comments will be sent to the author/s and must be provided in English. The confidential comments to the Editor, however, remain blind and will not be forwarded to the authors. The completed "**Manuscript Reviewer Form**" must be returned to the Editorial Office **within 30 days** via the **Manuscript Editorial System**. The final decision concerning acceptability of a manuscript is the responsibility of the Editorial Board of the Journal of Apicultural Science.

#### Conflict of Interest

By agreeing to perform a review, the Reviewer declares that s/he does not have any **conflict of interest** or competing financial interests with either the potential author/s or funder/s of their research (**Manuscript Reviewer Form**, SECTION A). Particularly, situations between the reviewer and author/s in respect to **direct personal relationships** (i.e.,

family relationship, legal ties, conflicts), **professional relationships** (i.e., professional affiliations, advisory positions, board memberships, project applications, patent applications/holdings), and direct scientific collaboration that may influence the objectivity of the review must be considered.

### **Confidentiality and Anonymity**

The **Journal of Apicultural Science** uses anonymous review process. All manuscripts submitted for review for the **Journal of Apicultural Science** must remain strictly confidential at all times. Reviewers must not copy or disclose the content of the manuscripts to any other person or institution except with the permission of the Editor. Reviewers must not use knowledge of the evaluated work before its publication to further their own or any third-party interests. The reviewers remain anonymous unless both the reviewer and the Editor agree otherwise. If you have any doubts that concern the confidentiality or anonymity of your review, please contact the Editors directly.

### **Guide to the Review Process**

Before writing your review, you may find it helpful to browse the **Guidelines for Authors** that are available at [www.degruyter.com/view/j/jas](http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/jas). A detailed **Manuscript Reviewer Form** is provided by the **Manuscript Editorial System** at [www.editorialsystem.com/jas](http://www.editorialsystem.com/jas) to guide the review process.

Please complete SECTION B of your review, answering all of the questions. If your answer to any of the questions is “No,” the explanation must be provided in SECTION E “Comments to the Author/s.” We encourage you to divide your comments into major and minor shortcomings (points b and c). If you consider it appropriate, provide an introductory paragraph summarizing the major findings of the article in SECTION E (point a). Any additional comments also should be provided in this section. Please use SECTION C, “Recommendation for the Editors,” to inform us about your final decision. If you advise that the article should be rejected, please give specific, clear reasons for your decision in SECTION D.

Any help you can provide in clarifying deficiencies of terminology, style, syntax, or grammar is desirable but not required. These deficiencies should not be a reason to reject a paper if its content warrants publication from a scientific point of view. All accepted manuscripts will undergo language editing by native English speakers.