

The guidelines for the reviewers are as follows

1. Kindly accept to review the paper in your area of specialization and return the manuscript with the comment within 15 days.
2. Kindly maintain confidentiality and reveal the details of the review to the concerned author.
3. Let your review be highly critic, constructive and the suggestions by the reviewer should help in refining the research methodologies and interpretations.
4. Kindly review the paper as early as possible and submit in a timely manner for the improvement of the quality of the journal.
5. Reviewers are requested to monitor the conflicts of interest and submit it to the editor.
6. Strictly prevent plagiarism
7. If the manuscript has been published elsewhere and if it is duplicated once again inform the details to the Editor.
8. Kindly provide your suggestions in such a way that helps the growth of the researcher and the journal by adding value with your rich experience.

2. A well-defined peer-review and publication policy of the journal

The journal is peer reviewed with the following guidelines

Reviewer's Information

First Name:	
Last Name:	
E-Mail:	
Title:	
Affiliation:	
Country:	
Specialization:	

Manuscript Information

Manuscript Number:	
Manuscript Title:	
Date Sent To Reviewer:	
Date Expected From Reviewer:	

Evaluation Report

General comment:	
Introduction:	
Methodology:	
Results:	
Discussion:	
Bibliography/References:	
Others:	
Decision:	

Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality:	
Contribution To The Field:	
Technical Quality:	
Clarity Of Presentation :	
Depth Of Research:	

Recommendation

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject on grounds of (Please be specific)	

Kindly mark with an X

Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments (Including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):

Ethics of the journal:

- Publisher will assume the responsibility to support the efforts made by the Editor and Peer Reviewers in maintaining the integrity of the scholarly records.
- Publisher ensures best practice followed in the publication.
- The Editor is solely responsible for considering the review by the peers and to accept the manuscript for publication.
- The Editor will ensure that the peer review process is unbiased, fair and timely.
- The manuscript will be reviewed by external peer reviewers specialized in the concerned area.
- The editorial committee and reviewer's panel are selected based on the specialization in different disciplines of plant pathology.
- The reviewer will bring to the notice of the Editor about the similarity or overlapping nature of the manuscript with other manuscript that has been already published.
- Disclosures of potential conflict of interest and suggestion for self-citation of the reviewer's contributions will be reviewed by the Editor to assess the biasness.
- Transparent mechanism to reconsider the appeal made by the authors on the decision made by the editorial committee has to be established by the Editor and publisher.
- The confidentiality of the communications pertaining to research manuscripts and to the reviewers is protected by the Editor.
- The reviewer's identity is protected unless and otherwise the reviewer is willing to disclose his identity.
- The confidentiality of the unpublished details provided in the manuscript is maintained by the editorial committee and will not be used for the personal benefit of the Editor or the reviewers.
- The Editor should not take any decision on the manuscripts submitted to the journal, if he or she or his team has submitted the manuscript for the journal. The decision will be taken by the independent reviewer.
- The potential conflicts of interest on the Editor by the author have to be informed well in advance to the publisher to avoid conflicts of interest.
- The Editorial committee should take care to prevent plagiarism
- The manuscript received for review from the Editor should be maintained with high level of confidentiality and the research mentioned in the manuscript should not be used by the reviewer or his team for their personal interest.
- Personal criticisms of the authors are not encouraged. The comment of the reviewers has to be submitted with supporting arguments.
- A reviewer should not ask to include his or her citation to boost their citation index unless it is essential for the manuscript submitted by the author.
- Authorship for the manuscript has to be given only if they have made substantial contribution to the research work included in the manuscript. That is the active involvement in conceptualization of ideas; interpretations of the results, designing of the experiment of the reported study alone are to be given with authorship.
- The members involved in language editing, funding, providing the lab facilities should be included in acknowledgement.

- The author for correspondence should ensure that all the co-authors have reviewed the manuscript, approve the final version and should accept for publication without any conflict of interest.
- The corresponding author should carefully list the order of co-authors during original submission. If there is any change to be made in the order of co-authors like inclusion or deletion will be done under exceptional case by the concurrence of the Editor.
- The use of chemicals, protocols and equipment that have potential animal or health hazard should be clearly mentioned in the manuscript.
- If the research involves the use of animals or human the author should submit a concurrence letter pertaining to the legal issues enlightening the research has been carried out with the approval of the Institutional committee.