



Agricultural Economics Research Review

Peer Review Policy

All published articles in ‘Agricultural Economics Research Review’ (AERR) Journal undergo rigorous peer review processes based on initial Chief Editor screening and then by anonymized refereeing by the referee. The ultimate purpose of peer review is to sustain the originality and quality of research work and filtration of poor quality and plagiarized articles. Peer review assures research quality.

Peer Review Policy

The practice of peer review is to ensure that only good work is published. Our reviewers therefore play a vital role in maintaining the high standards of the Journal AERR and all manuscripts are peer reviewed following the procedure outlined below.

Initial manuscript evaluation

The Chief Editor first screen all manuscripts along with subject matter expert in the Editorial Board. Those rejected at this stage are insufficiently original, have serious scientific flaws, have poor grammar, or English language, or are outside the aims and scope of the journal. Those that meet the minimum criteria are passed on to experts for review. Authors of manuscripts rejected at this stage are informed within 2 weeks of receipt of manuscript.

Type of Peer Review

The Journal ‘Agricultural Economics Research Review’ uses Double-blind peer review: Reviewers are unaware of the identity of the authors, and authors are also unaware of the identity of reviewers.

How the reviewer is selected

Reviewers are matched to the paper according to their expertise. Our reviewer database contains reviewer contact details together with their subject areas of interest, and this is constantly being updated.

Reviewer reports

Reviewers are asked to evaluate whether the manuscript:

- Is original
- Is methodologically sound
- Follows appropriate ethical guidelines
- Has results which are clearly presented and support the conclusions
- Correctly referenced previous relevant work

Reviewers are not expected to correct or copyedit manuscripts. Language correction is not part of the peer review process. Reviewers are requested to refrain from giving their personal opinion in the "Reviewer blind comments to Author" section of their review on whether or not the paper should be published. Personal opinions can be expressed in the "Reviewer confidential comments to Chief Editor" section.

How long does the peer review process take?

Typically, the manuscript is reviewed within 2-8 weeks of submission to the reviewer. Should the reviewers' reports contradict one another, or a report is unnecessarily delayed a further expert opinion is sought. Revised manuscripts are usually returned to the Chief Editor within 3 weeks and the Chief Editor may request further advice from the reviewers at this time.

Final report

Reviewers advise the Chief Editor, who is responsible for the final decision to revise, accept or reject the article. A decision to revise, accept or reject the manuscript is sent to the author along with any recommendations made by the reviewers, and may include verbatim comments by the reviewers. The Chief Editor may request the authors for more than one revision of a manuscript.

Chief Editor's Decision is final

Special Issues / Conference Proceedings

Special issues and/or conference proceedings may have different peer review procedures involving, for example, Guest Editors, conference organizers or scientific committees.