

Guideline for reviewer: Nepalese Horticulture

All the reviewers are requested to evaluate the manuscript against the following guidelines.

Background:

The 'Nepalese Horticulture' journal is an official publication of Nepal Horticulture Society. The society was established in 1990 and is one of the oldest professional society of Nepal. The society started to publish the journal since 1997. It is an open access and single blind peer reviewed journal.

Review invitation:

The reviewers are requested to submit the response whether to accept or decline the invitation of the review. If the journal does not receive any response within the three consecutive days of invitation, it is considered that the invitation to review is declined automatically. In general, the journal provides four weeks' period for reviewing a manuscript. The reviewers are kindly requested to thoroughly evaluate the manuscript whether the manuscript falls under your areas of expertise or not. If the manuscript does not fit well with the expertise of the reviewer, we kindly request you to send back your response as "Decline review". The reviewers are also requested to "Decline review" if there exists any kind of potential "conflict of interest" with the manuscript. Besides, the reviewers are also kindly requested to consider the deadline of the review.

Manuscript review process:

The manuscript is divided into following sections: Title, abstract, introduction, materials and methods, result, discussion (result and discussion combine or separate), conclusion and references. The reviewers are requested to evaluate the manuscript against all the sections and provide your rating in the "manuscript evaluation form". The additional comments can be inserted under the "comments to author" section of the evaluation form. The additional sheet could be submitted if needed.

Title:

- Title should be representative of the manuscript

Abstract:

- The abstract should be precise and mirror of the manuscript
- Does it contain problem/objective statement?
- Does it contain brief methods of the research?
- Does it contain main result? Is it accurate and precise?
- Does it contain concluding sentences?

Introduction:

- Is the information included relevant to the topic?
- Logical flow of the sentences and arguments
- Does it contain the objective of the research?

- Does it state the novelty of the research?

Materials and Methods:

The reviewers are requested to clearly state any flaws observed in materials and methods section. This section is very critical and reflects the overall quality of the manuscript. It is also taken as one of the major criterion for evaluation and the final decision could also be influenced by the robustness of the research methodology. Evaluation should be made against the following points-

- Soundness/robustness of the methodology
- Clarity of the methodology. The methodology should be understandable and replicable
- Is the research design accurate and appropriate?
- Does it contain satisfactory number of the analytical and biological replicates?
- Is the sampling method accurate?

Results:

Findings of the research could be made based on the data presented for publication. Any perception and flaws should be avoided in the manuscript.

- Accurateness of the table and figure
- Have the authors drawn inferences of the table and figures accurately

Discussion:

The result of the research should be validated well. The following points could be taken as consideration-

- Validation of the findings by previous findings
- Is it logical and accurately fits with the result?
- Does the manuscript contain sufficient explanation of findings?

Conclusion:

The conclusion section should be precise and short depicting the major findings along with the way forward.

Decision:

The journal highly respects the recommendation of the reviewer and the editor reaches on the conclusion based on the recommendation from the reviewers. Any of the recommendation should be followed by the strong scientific logic. This explanation could be written in "comments to authors" section. The following recommendation should be made based on the rating of the manuscript.

Accept as it is: If the manuscript does not contain the room for improvement such as the findings of the research has wider applicability and very novel, the argument/explanations are very logical, methodology is very robust, the reviewer can recommend the manuscript as "Accept as it is"

Accept after major revision: The finding of the research is very novel and relevant in current context but the manuscript requires substantial revision, the reviewer can opt for this decision. The robustness of the methodology should be evaluated very well.

Accept after minor revision: If the manuscript requires minor correction such as addition of text in introduction section, addition of discussion/explanation in few/some of the results and other minor correction.

Reject: If the manuscript contains major flaws in materials and method section, poorly written, requires very substantial revision and insufficient explanation of the findings, the reviewer can recommend the manuscript as "Reject". The decision "Reject" makes the author(s) unhappy so, the reviewer should put very logical and scientific argument before reaching to this decision.

Submission of the review work:

The reviewer can make the comments in word file as track changes or in a separate sheet. The comments along with the manuscript evaluation sheet should be submitted to the journal within the given deadline.

Editor's decision:

The journal respects the recommendation of the reviewer and the editor's decision mainly rely on the suggestion from the reviewers. The editor will seek third opinion from the blind reviewer/the Editor-In-Chief if the views from two reviewers contradicts. The final decision on whether to accept or reject the manuscript will be based on the suggestion from the reviewers, Editor-In-Chief and the evaluation from the handling editor. The decision will be mailed to the author at the earliest possible once the handling editor received views from all the concerning parties.

Code of conduct for reviewer:

- The reviewer(s) are not allowed to disclose any information related to the manuscript
- All the information provided/used should be taken as the confidential documents
- The reviewer(s) are not allowed to use any data produced by the authors as reference materials before the manuscript is published
- Don't make any adhoc comments without any scientific base and valid evidence
- If the invited reviewer happens to be a part of the article, directly or indirectly, the reviewer must return the article immediately without review.