

Peer Review Policy:

ONE HEALTH JOURNAL
Founded in 2022 by the State Scientific and Research Institute for Laboratory diagnostics
and Veterinary and Sanitary Expertize (SSRILDVSE)
and
One Health Institute, NGO (NGO OHI)

Peer reviewing policy

Guide for reviewers

Submitted manuscripts are reviewed by 2 (or more) experts. Peer reviewers will be asked to recommend whether a manuscript should be accepted, revised or rejected. They should also alert the editors of any issues relating to author misconduct, such as plagiarism and unethical behavior.

OHJ operates using a double-blind peer review system, in which both authors and reviewers are anonymous.

Publication of research articles is primarily dependent on their validity and coherence, as judged by peer reviewers and editors.

The reviewers may also be asked whether the writing is comprehensible. Submitted manuscripts will be sent to peer reviewers unless they are out of scope of the journal, or if the presentation or written English is of an unacceptably low standard. Authors who are not native English speakers are strongly encouraged to submit their manuscript to us for review and clarification. Note that the use of such service is at the author's own expense and does not guarantee that the article will be accepted for publication.

Points to Consider

Reviewers are asked to provide detailed, constructive comments that will help the editors make a decision regarding publication and how the authors could improve their manuscript. A key issue is whether the work has serious methodological flaws that should preclude its publication, or whether additional experiments or data are required to support the conclusions. Where possible, reviewers should provide references to substantiate their comments.

Reviewers should address the points below and indicate whether they consider any required revisions to be 'major revisions' or 'minor revisions.' In general, revisions are likely to be 'major revisions' if additional data are required to support the claims or the interpretations are not supported by the data; if further analysis is required that may change the conclusions; or if the methods used are inadequate or contain statistical errors.

[The reviewer's letter template](#)

Dear REVIEWER!

On behalf of the Editorial Board, the editors of One Health Journal are asking you to read the article by the authors _____ and draw a conclusion regarding its compliance with the scientific profile and the feasibility of publication in One Health Journal. We remind you that the review is confidential. In order to speed up the publication of the article, the editors must receive your feedback no later than _____. Please let us know if for some reason you are unable to provide a review. If it is necessary to finalize the article, the editors will ask you to mark the corrected version.

Please answer the questions below (underlining required) and return feedback to the editors (e-mail: prezyd.o.h.institute@gmail.com).

Feedback on the article

Is the relevance of scientific research based on modern requirements of world science? (Yes No)

Is there sufficient depth of treatment of the topic? (yes, no, not completely)

Does the article contain material that warrants its publication in a journal? (Yes No)

Is the fundamentality and scientific novelty of the research results highlighted? (yes,) Please describe this point in "personal remarks", do not clearly indicate what exactly is the fundamentality or novelty of the manuscript.

Is there a reported description of research methods from the creation of the experiment by other researchers? (yes, no, not completely)

Did the research findings reveal themes? (yes, no, not completely)

Correspondence to the title and content of the materials. The logic and sequence of the presentation of the material. Availability of modern statistical processing of results (experiment) (yes, no, not completely)

Is there a mandatory comparative analysis of the stated topic in the discussion? (yes, no, not completely)

Are the conclusions made by the authors justified? (yes, no, not completely)

Is the manuscript plagiarized or self-plagiarized and has it not been published before? (yes, no, not completely)

Is there a need for an out-of-the-ordinary publication of the article to establish the advantage (yes, no)?

Are the literary qualities of the article satisfactory and is the scientific style of presentation observed? (yes, no)

Is the terminology used legitimately and is it up-to-date? (Yes No)

Is the quality of graphic design acceptable? (Yes No)

What needs to be shortened in the article (text, figures, tables, list of references)?

Citation of scientific sources (time period – recent (up to 5 years) publications are desired, or relevant references in terms of quantity, relevance, modernity, availability of DOI, presence in the global network of scientific information (yes, no, incomplete)

Please pay attention to whether ethical standards for scientific works have been observed (see the One Health Journal website).

Your personal comments (can be submitted on a separate page) are attached

The article is rejected (explain the motive in detail) ...see below.....

Recommendations: accept the article, reject it, send it to the authors for revision (emphasis required).

Signature (The reviewer has the right not to decipher his signature - the editors have full information about the reviewer)

Note! Reviewers are reminded of the importance of timely reviews (3 days for confirming reviewing agreement and 3 weeks till submission of opinion)

Confidentiality

Any manuscript sent for peer review is a confidential document and should remain so until it is formally published.