**Reviewer Guidelines**

Submissions *undergo a double-blind review process in which the identities of the*author(s) and reviewer(s) are not disclosed.

Each paper submitted to the *Vallis Aurea (Journal of Sustainable Development and Innovation)*is subject to the following review procedures:

1. the editors review it for general suitability for this publication
2. it is checked using a unique software program for preventing plagiarism using Turnitin
3. two reviewers are selected, and a double-blind review process takes place
4. based on the recommendations of the reviewers, the editors then decide whether the particular article should be accepted, revised or rejected, or the third (fourth) reviewer will be engaged.

Reviewers’ comments will be returned to the original author.  Where appropriate, authors will be encouraged to revise the paper and resubmit it for further consideration.

Papers are categorised under one of these *classifications:*

* ***Original scientific paper –***it contains unpublished results of original scientific research, and the scientific information is exposed so that the accuracy of the analyses and extracts on which the results are based can be verified
* ***Preliminary communication –***It contains previously unpublished preliminary results of ongoing scientific research that should be published soon. It does not necessarily have enough detail to repeat and verify the results.
* ***Review article –***A review paper is a scientific paper that contains an original, concise and critical presentation of an area or part of it in which the author actively works. The role of the author’s original contribution to the field must be emphasised, considering the already published works and the review of those works. The review also contains the latest information on the current state of development and direction (so-called state-of-the-art reviews). They can be written by one or a group of authors and are usually written at the editor's request.

The peer review process is an independent quality control procedure for articles submitted to the journal. Because it is so difficult for authors to be objective about their writing, they benefit greatly from having someone else read and comment on their work. Peer review enhances the quality, credibility, and acceptability of published research and practice papers.

Please observe the following *guidelines*on the role of the reviewer:

* **Expertise:** Papers are not always sent to a reviewer whose field is identical to the subject matter of that paper. You do not have to be precisely qualified in a field to be a constructive reviewer. On the contrary, an excellent paper will speak beyond its narrowly defined field. If a paper is so distant from your field that you do not feel qualified to judge its merits, please return it to the journal's publishing manager, who will locate another reviewer.
* **Confidentiality:** Reviewers receive unpublished work, which must be considered confidential until published. Reviewers must not disclose to others which papers they have reviewed, nor are they to share those papers with any other person.
* **Conflict of Interest:** Reviewers must declare any conflict of interest or any other factor which may affect their independence – in cases, for instance, where they have received a paper from a colleague or an intellectual opponent. In cases of conflict of interest, please notify the editorial team of your inability to review a particular paper.
* **Intellectual Merit**: A paper must be judged on its intellectual merits alone. Personal criticism or criticism based solely on the reviewer's political or social views is not acceptable.
* **Full Explanation:** Critical or negative judgments must be fully supported by detailed reference to evidence from the paper under review or other relevant sources.
* **Plagiarism and Copyright:** If a reviewer considers that a paper may contain plagiarism or that it might breach another party’s copyright, they should notify the editors, providing the relevant citations to support their claim.
* **Responsiveness:** Reviewers are asked to return their reports within four weeks.