

The Editorial Board and Practices

I. Objective of the Journal

The Mission of Greener Journals (GJ) is to contribute towards the advancement of knowledge and general discoveries, by providing free access to quality research information online.

II. The Editorial Board

The Editorial team of Greener Journals comprises of the Editorial Committee, Committee on Ethics, editors, Editorial Board and Editorial Office (editorial assistants). Editors and editorial board members are selected by the Editorial Committee based on:

1. Their qualifications and professional experiences,
2. The Journal's need for international representation and
3. The need to maintain a high journal standard and editorial policy.

Application to Join the Editorial Team:

Interested persons may apply to become part of our editorial team by filling the online editorial partnership form. Visit our review website www.review.gjournals.org for more information.

Appointment as Editorial team member:

Greener Journals will view the CV of applicants to make selections for editorial appointment. On appointment, an appointment letter will be sent to selected persons via email. If the appointed members accept the positions offered to them, a printed and signed attestation letter will be sent via regular post to the addresses of the appointed members.

Reward for Editorial Team and External Reviewers:

Reviewers are entitled to receive an attestation letter and will be considered for a partial fee waiver or full fee waiver.

III. Peer Review

All manuscripts submitted to Greener Journals go through a peer-review process **that determines if a manuscript is fit or unfit for publication.** Greener Journals requires that individuals who are highly competent and recognized in the particular field of the submitted manuscript review each manuscript. Manuscripts undergo a double blind peer review process. Greener Journals will use its review website www.review.gjournals.org to organize the review. Editorial team members are expected to sign up to access the full features of the website.

The Review Process

The Editorial office will contact those reviewers that have been identified as qualified and the reviewers that may be recommended by the authors. Once potential reviewers agree to read a manuscript, they are given a period to complete the review. Greener Journals ensures that at least two reviewers undertake the review.

When the reviews are completed, a decision is made to either accept the paper or give the authors the opportunity to revise it according to reviewers' suggestions or to reject the paper based on the reviewers' criticisms and the editors' opinion on the paper. Depending on this evaluation, manuscripts may be accepted, returned for further revision, or rejected. Revised manuscripts are evaluated to determine if the author(s) have adequately addressed the issues and responded to the criticisms of the reviewers and editors. When an editor has completed his decision on a manuscript, a decision letter is sent to the author. If a paper is accepted, the paper is immediately sent to the publication office and slotted in for the next available issue. Greener Journals tries to complete the review and decision on manuscript within 2-3 weeks. This time may vary, depending on the amount of revision that needs to be completed before the manuscript is accepted.

IV. Grounds for Declining a Manuscript

Greener Journals (GJ) may decline a manuscript after it has completed the review process. Manuscripts that do not meet the standards of the journal are returned to authors with extensive comments describing the basis for the decision. Manuscripts may be rejected if it is observed that the findings are not sufficiently original, do not provide adequate new insights, do not contain an adequate amount of new information, or are too preliminary to warrant publication. Manuscripts that default in meeting with our ethics policies will also be rejected. Rejection of manuscripts should majorly depend on the above criteria rather than defects in the manuscript format that can easily be corrected. We will offer authors further assistance to ensure the manuscript takes the format specified in the Instructions for Authors.

V. Guidelines

A. Obligations of an Editor

1. The Editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based majorly on the paper's importance, originality, clarity, and the study's relevance to the remit of the journal.
2. The Editor should make unbiased decisions on all manuscripts offered for publication, with no regards to gender, race, ethnic origin, religious belief, citizenship, or political viewpoint of the author(s).

3. The editor should process manuscripts promptly.
4. The editor has the complete responsibility and authority to accept a paper for publication or to reject it. Our new editorial process gives room to other editorial board members to give their decisions before the editor gives the final decision. Greener Journals may review decisions made by editors that go contrary to the decision of the majority (reviewers and editorial board members).
5. The Editor should not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than reviewers and potential reviewers.
6. The Editor's need to accept or reject a manuscript should not be influenced by pressure from the editor's employer, the journal's owner or the publisher.
7. If mistakes are discovered that can affect the interpretation of data or information presented in the article, with credible evidence that the information on a published paper is incorrect, the editor should facilitate publication of a corrected paper by informing the editorial office, pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it.
8. Editors should take suspected cases of plagiarism seriously.
9. Editors should be observant for images or information in a manuscript that might have cultural significance or cause offence.
10. The Editor should respect the intellectual independence of authors. The information, arguments, or interpretations in an unpublished manuscript should not be used in an editor's own research without the consent of the author.
11. Editorial duty for any manuscript authored by the editor and submitted to the journal should be passed on to some other qualified Editorial team members. The Editor should prevent situations of real or perceived conflicts of interest. Such conflicts can also include, handling papers from students or colleagues with whom the editor has recently worked together, and from those in the same institution

B. Obligations of a Reviewer

1. Although the review process is an essential step before a manuscript can be published, reviewers are obligated to be fair, logical and unbiased when reviewing a manuscript. This should not be an opportunity to discredit a manuscript for selfish reasons. Reviewers should be able to explain and support their judgments properly so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Reviewers that default by sending unfair and biased comments will be blacklisted.
2. A Reviewer who observes that he/she is not sufficiently qualified or lacks the time to review a manuscript should immediately alert our editorial office. The reviewer can also suggest other reviewers that are qualified to review the manuscript.
3. A Reviewer that has accepted to review a manuscript should be responsible to give a feedback after receiving the manuscript. It is an unethical and a suspicious behavior for reviewers to stop communicating after receiving a manuscript.

4. A Reviewer should comment on the originality of the study and its importance to the field of study. Reviewers should be able to have learnt something new if the research question and study is original. If the research question is unoriginal because, related work has been published previously, please give references. The research question should easily be identified and clearly understood. Also, reviewers should indicate if the conclusion from the study is clear, understandable and valid.
5. A Reviewer should ensure that the data of the study is authentic, adequate and well utilized. Please indicate unsuitable use of data and state your reasons. Alternative data sources may as well be suggested. In addition, elaborate on your reason, if you think that more evidence is required to back up the results.
6. A Reviewer should ensure that the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) is balanced, supported by the data and without exaggerations.
7. A Reviewer should be watchful to observe authors failure to cite relevant works. A reviewer should check if the authors provided adequate references where necessary. A reviewer should alert the editorial office of any suspected plagiarism or any other unethical conduct. Reviewers should provide a link to the published manuscript, in a case of plagiarism.
8. A Reviewer should answer these questions: Are the methods suitable? Is it well defined and detailed enough to allow peers in that field to reproduce the work? Have the experiments been properly performed and are they adequate. Are the experimental techniques consistent and suitable? Please give sufficient details if further improvements are to be made on the study method. Also clearly explain in detail, if more experiments should be carried out.
9. A Reviewer should be observant of the appearance of a conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is strongly related to the reviewer's work in progress or published. The reviewer should return the manuscript promptly without review, advising the editor of the conflict of interest or bias.
10. A Reviewer should not review a manuscript that has been authored or co-authored by a person personally or professionally connected to the reviewer if the connection would lead to a bias judgment of the manuscript.
11. Manuscripts received by a reviewer should be treated as confidential. It should not be exposed or discussed with others except, on rare occasions to persons from whom specific guidance may be sought; in such a case, their identities should be made known to our editorial office.
12. A Reviewer must not disclose or use the manuscript's content.
13. A Reviewer should return the review comment promptly, usually within ten (10) days of receiving a manuscript. If reviewers require additional time, they should contact the editorial office promptly for additional time or to assign other reviewers.
14. Discussion forums may be created for the reviewers of a manuscript to deliberate on issues regarding the manuscript with the editor. Reviewers should be of best conduct and should be rational and respectful in their comments as they communicate with the other reviewers. Reviewers can disagree with the decision and opinion of another reviewer but, in a polite and professional manner.

15. A Reviewer should identify and assist in correcting grammatical errors while reading through the manuscript. Manuscripts with complex grammatical errors should be brought to our notice or indicated on the Reviewers' Guide.
16. If the references of a manuscript are too long and burdensome for a reviewer to check, the reviewer should indicate this on the Reviewers' Guide.
17. A Reviewer of a manuscript may sometimes be contacted by our editorial office to re-evaluate the manuscript and give a binding decision after the author has returned the revised manuscript.