



Reviewer Guidelines

The Peer-Review Process

The main objective of peer-review is to improve the quality of submitted articles. It is an essential component of a journal's publication process for maintaining high-quality standards. At least two potential reviewers review the manuscript submitted to *Journal of Essential Oil & Plant Composition (JEOPC)*.

Reviewers are requested to assess the quality of the manuscripts and provide recommendations to the editor on the manuscript for accepting, rejecting or revisions. *JEOPC* requested to provide authentic, sincere and positive review comments and criticism for each manuscript in order to improve the quality of the submitted articles. We are determined to recognize reviewers' efforts.

The Advantages of Volunteer Reviewers

When reviewing for *JEOPC*, the reviewer will:

- Receive a thanks mail and reviewer certificate
- Be included in the annual reviewer acknowledgement list.
- Receive reviewer award annually based on outstanding performance
- Be endorsed and verify your review on Web of Science profile.
- The reviewer is eligible for a full waiver based on satisfactory performance of sincere reviewing.
- Develop scholarly, research, and teaching abilities.

Confidentiality

Reviewers must maintain their confidentiality regarding the manuscript's content. They must be aware of revealing their identity to the authors. After submitting the review report, the reviewer will be notified by email of the other reviewers' reports. The review reports and authors' responses will not be published on the journal website. Reviewers can evaluate the manuscript independently and must complete the review report form.

Potential Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers should notify the journal editor if they have a conflict of interest that could bias the review and influence the report.

Review Process

JEOPC employs a double-blind review system until the review process is completed. Each reviewer will be invited to review the manuscript via email or the Journal management system. A title and abstract of the manuscript will be sent at the time of invitation. After accepting the review invitation, the reviewer will receive a full manuscript through email or access by the Journal management system.

Reviewer Guidelines

Responsibilities of Reviewers

- Reviewers are discouraged to mention their citation of their work and their colleagues if it is not necessary to improve the quality of the manuscript under review.
- The reviewer must be strict about plagiarism of the article and must notify the editorial office immediately if anything catches their eyes.
- A reviewer is requested to submit his or her review report within 10 days of accepting the invitation from the editorial office. If they require additional time, they must contact the editorial office.
- While reviewing the manuscript, reviewers should not be biased or partial.
- Criticism should not be presented mindlessly and offensive remarks are not acceptable.
- The reviewer's comments cannot be influenced by the reviewer's ethnicity, national origin, language, race, religion, or place of birth.

The review report includes:

A summary:

A summary is a brief paragraph that summarizes the manuscript's main scientific contribution, aim, and objectives.

The overall evaluation of article: Accept/Minor revision/Major Revision/ Reject in current form, but maybe resubmitted/Reject.

General comments:

Comments on each section of the manuscript (title, abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, conclusion and underlining areas of strength and weakness) must be described clearly in order to response by the authors.

General Comments may focus on the following suggestions:

Strengths:

- Clarity in abstract
- Scientific rigor
- Clear presentation of results
- Comparisons with previous studies
- Biological relevance
- Implications for future research
- Areas for potential improvement
- Consistency in presentation
- Subheadings for chemical composition section
- Consideration of figure types

Please take the following into consideration while you read the article:

Title

Does it convey the content of the article clearly?

Reviewer Guidelines

Abstract

Does it accurately sum up the article's contents?

Introduction

Does it clearly define the issue under consideration and describe the veracity of the information provided by the author?

The introduction should typically include a synopsis of the background of the research, an explanation of the research's conclusions, and any additional findings that are presented for debate.

Materials and method

The methodology, assumptions, and experiments used in this study should all be explained.

- Does the author describe the data collection process accurately?
- Is the theoretical foundation or reference employed suitable for this study?
- Is the exposure design appropriate for the question's answer?
- Is there enough information for you to replicate the research?
- Does the article mention any of the following procedures?
- Are there any novel approaches? Is there a new way described in detail by the author?
- Is there adequate sampling?
- Have the tools and materials utilized been sufficiently described? Does the article exposure indicate what sort of data is captured, as well as the measurement?

Results

The author must discuss the findings of his or her study in this section. It should be well-organized and in a logical order. You must assess if the right analysis was performed, as well as the usage of statistical techniques. If you have superior statistical techniques to employ in this study, please mention with proper citation and the interpretation does not need to be provided in this part.

Tables and Pictures

Does it make sense to support the reasoning that was mentioned by providing data that is clear and easy for readers to understand?

Discussion and Conclusion

- Are the arguments made in this section reasonable and justified by fair results?
- Does the author make any comparisons between the research findings and earlier ones?
- Do the study findings present in the paper conflict with earlier theories?
- Does the conclusion describe how future scientific research may be improved?

Reviewer Guidelines

Specific comments

Reviewer can express their specific comments to the editor for improving the quality of the manuscript

- Emphasizing novelty or significance
- Is there any plagiarism in this paper field that exceeds 20%?
- The language, grammar, and style of the long sentences

For further guidance, please refer to the following documents:

COPE with Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. Committee on Publication Ethics. [Available online.](#)

Current Science Publishing invites interested reviewers to join our journal.

Please send us your CV along with your research interest to the journal office.

Managing Editor

Current Science Publishing

E-mail: jeopc@currentsci.com

managing-editor@currentsci.com

jeopc.csp@gmail.com