

Journal of Horticultural Research

The reviewing process

The review process at Journal of Horticultural Research is carried out in three stages. First, the Editor-in-Chief evaluates if the paper meets the formal criteria and falls within the scope of the Journal, and assigns the manuscript to selected Editorial Board member according to his/her research expertise. The assigned Board Member evaluates paper specifically and decides whether to reject it or send to two experts for reviewing. The final decision on acceptance is made by the Editor-in-Chief, considering the opinion of the reviewers and the assigned Board Member, with the eventual help of other Editorial Board members, if necessary.

Tips for the reviewers

The review process in Journal of Horticultural Research is anonymous (double-blind review). The review shall be clear, detailed, timely, and shall reflect the unbiased opinion on the scientific quality of the contribution. Reviewers are asked to be impartial in their opinion. If they cannot separate the evaluation process from their personal views or if they have a conflict of interest, they should excuse themselves from reviewing. They are also expected to protect the confidentiality of the manuscript and ensure that it is not disseminated or exploited in any form prior to publication.

Evaluation of the scientific content

1. Is the subject of the article relevant to the journal's scope?
2. Does the research present new findings in the area?
3. Are the data presented scientifically sound?
4. Does the research have practical importance?
5. Is the research of the international/global importance?

Evaluation of the presentation

6. Is the paper clearly written and well-organized?
7. Is the Abstract adequate and presents all the important information?
8. Are Keywords and Abbreviations adequate?
9. Does the Introduction present the state of art in the area and the objective of the?
10. Does the Materials and Methods describe precisely experimental material, procedures and statistical analyses?
11. Are all the Tables and Figures necessary and clearly presented?
12. Is the Discussion adequate?
13. Are the conclusions justified by the data presented?
14. Have all the relevant literature been cited?

Overall assessment

15. I recommend this paper to:
 - a. Accept as is, with minor editorial corrections if needed
 - b. Accept after minor revision (comments)
 - c. Accept after major revision and re-evaluation (comments)
 - d. Reject