

GUIDELINE FOR REVIEWERS

The manuscript must conform to requirements set forth in the Guideline for Authors.

The reviewer must be fair, unbiased and confidential. Author's style or writing should not be changed if the meaning is clear. When corrections are necessary, revision should be offered as a suggestion. Prompt attention to manuscript will be appreciated by the authors and the editor.

DO NOT FORGET

1. The reviewing period is four weeks from the date that the manuscript is assigned by the editor. The reviewed manuscript should be returned to the editor by both e-mail and by mail.
2. Reviewers will remain anonymous.
3. Reviewer should not rewrite a poorly written manuscript, but should give his own comments and recommendations.
4. The manuscript should not be reproduced while being in the custody of the reviewer.

Use the following guidelines to evaluate the manuscript:

QUALITY OF THE WRITING

1. Is the manuscript readable, organized and appropriate length according to data presented? Can you make some suggestions for the improvement of the manuscript?
2. Clarity of the manuscript is vitally important. The manuscript's content should be understood, whether the reader is an expert in the discussed matter or not.
3. Is there unnecessary repetition in the manuscript?
4. Are the topics discussed in logical sequence set forth in the Guide for Authors?

TITLE

Title of the manuscript should not contain more than 10 to 12 words. It should be appropriate for the material presented and descriptive of the work.

SUMMARY

Every manuscript must contain a summary. From the summary the reader must be able to tell the value of the paper and whether or not to read it completely. It also should provide the literature searcher with enough information to assess its value and to index it for later retrieval.

The summary should:

1. Contain up to 250 words
2. Be clear, informative, brief and representative of the manuscript

3. Give a brief account of the purpose, need and significance of the subject

4. State the objectives clearly as it what is to be obtained

5. Give a brief account of the methods used

6. Identify scientific names of plants, organisms and chemicals

7. Never cite references

MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Is the manuscript technically accurate in the terms of methods, procedures, replications and statistics?
2. Have all measurements been presented in SI units?
3. Have all organism, chemicals, soils and other materials been properly identified by their common and scientific names?
4. Are the statistical methods adequate for analysis of available data?

RESULTS

1. Are the experimental results sufficient to justify the conclusion?
2. Are the results relevant to the objectives of the study?

DISCUSSION

1. Are the experimental results successfully and adequately interpreted in the discussion?
2. Does the author compare obtained results with the experiments and results of other previous studies on the related subject?

CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions sound and logically derived from presented data?

REFERENCES:

1. Are all references cited listed in the reference list and vice versa?
2. Is there too many or two few references?

TABLES AND FIGURES:

1. Is the number of tables and figures appropriate?
2. Are they understandable independent of the text?
3. Do tables and figures present data clearly and concisely?
4. Are tables and figures appropriately numbered according to their sequence in the text? (references to all tables should be mentioned in the text)