



Peer review policy

All titles we publish strive to uphold the highest standards of impartiality and fairness. This policy describes the general principles and procedure operated by JGERC Publishing for peer review on the majority of its titles.

General procedure

Pre-refereeing stage:

Upon receiving a new manuscript, the editorial office conducts initial pre-refereeing checks to ensure the article is legible, complete, correctly formatted, original, within the scope of the journal in question, in the style of a scientific article and written in clear English. Any article that has problems with any of the above criteria may be rejected at this stage.

Refereeing stage:

Articles passing successfully through the pre-refereeing stage then begin formal peer review (Double blind review).

Double blind review:

Both the reviewer and the author are anonymous.

1. Author anonymity prevents any reviewer bias, for example based on an author's country of origin or previous controversial work.
2. Articles written by prestigious or renowned authors are considered on the basis of the content of their papers, rather than their reputation.
3. Reviewers can often identify the author through their writing style, subject matter or self-citation.

Research papers submitted for publication in the JGERC journal is generally sent to two independent referees who are asked to report on the quality, novelty, significance to the field and presentation. (Non-paper article types, such as reviews or notes, may differ. See the 'Specific article types' section below).

Referees are selected from our reviewer database and we try to find the best combination of scientific expertise and referee experience for each paper.

Authors are welcome to suggest referees for their paper if they wish but this is not required. In the interests of impartiality, if an author-suggested reviewer is used then we will complement this with a review from a second referee chosen by the journal from the general referee pool.

If there is sufficient agreement between the referees:

1. The paper may be accepted in current form;
2. The referees' reports may be sent to the authors for revision of the paper;
3. The paper may be rejected; or



4. If the paper contains too many errors or problems for the referees to comment fully on the scientific content, the authors will be asked to make corrections and then resubmit the article.

In the case of rejection, authors have the right to appeal against this decision to the editorial board. For further details on our appeals policy please see the 'Appeals' section below.

Use of an adjudicator:

If the referees' reports are not in agreement, the paper and the reports are sent to an adjudicator (often a board member) who is first asked to form their own opinion of the paper and then to read the referees' reports and adjudicate between them. If a referee is overruled by an adjudicator, we will notify the referee of this.

Revised papers:

When authors make revisions to their article in response to the referees' comments they are asked to submit a list of changes and any replies for transmission to the referees. The revised version is usually returned to at least one of the original referees who is then asked whether the revisions are satisfactory. If the referees remain dissatisfied, the paper can be referred to the editorial board of the journal for further consideration.

Refereeing times:

We are proud that our journal processing times are consistently among the fastest in the communities we serve. If a reviewer proves unable to report, we will try to find an alternative referee as quickly as possible. However, if a referee requests a short extension to their deadline for providing a report, we will usually grant this if it is reasonable. We try to strike a balance between the needs of authors (who will often ask for as fast a review as possible), and those of referees (who will often prefer to have more time to thoroughly study the paper and compose their report).

In those rare cases where an article's review process has been delayed due to unexpected difficulties in obtaining reports, we make use of our editorial board members' expertise to conclude the process swiftly.

Appeals:

Authors have the right to appeal against a rejection from our journal, whether it is after full review with referee reports or at the pre-refereeing stage. To lodge an appeal the author should contact the journal e-mail address, outlining their case for reconsideration. In order to be considered appeals must directly address the reasons given for the initial rejection decision. If referee reports were included with the rejection letter then these criticisms must be responded to in the appeal. Appeals that do not address referees' comments, or which dismiss them out of hand, will not be considered.

Appeals are then sent to a member of the journal's editorial board for consideration. If successful, an appeal can lead to the article's review being resumed and the article may ultimately be published following any revisions the board feels are necessary. However, if



Journal of
Genetic and Environmental Resources Conservation
www.jgerc.com

the appeal is rejected then the original rejection decision is upheld and no further consideration of that article is possible.

Specific article types:

Slightly different processes are in place for non-paper article types (e.g. Topical Reviews, Fast Track Communications, etc.) though the overall structure of the process will be the same. Please refer to the individual journal's homepage, or enquire with the journal team via e-mail, for more details.



Editorial Office,
Sweden

Journal of Genetic and Environmental Resources Conservation

Address: Sturegatan 13 B LGH 1002, 63230 Eskilstuna, Sweden.

E-mail : editorjgerc@gmail.com

Mobile : 0046765718991