

Peer-review policy

Editorial documents · 1.0.0 · 2026-10-13

AGM Scientific Publishing Academy | editorial@agmjurnal.uz

This electronic edition presents the journal's public policies for authors, reviewers and readers. The edition mark identifies the journal brand; no approving person's signature or approval resolution is asserted.

Editorial assessment, confidential expert review, decisions, and fair opportunities to respond.

1. Initial editorial assessment

The editorial process begins with an assessment of scope, completeness, presentation, and obvious integrity concerns. A manuscript may be returned for missing information or declined when it is unsuitable for the journal. Authors should receive a clear editorial outcome. Passing this stage does not guarantee external review or eventual publication.

2. Review model and anonymity

The intended review workflow is double blind: author identities and reviewer identities are withheld from the other party where practicable. Authors should prepare an anonymised review copy with separate title information. Self-citations may remain when academically necessary but should use neutral wording. Complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed in specialised fields or for publicly available preprints.

3. Reviewer selection and duties

Reviewers should have relevant expertise, sufficient independence, and the ability to provide a reasoned assessment. They must disclose interests that could affect judgement and decline where those interests cannot be managed. Reviews should address methods, evidence, originality, clarity, and limitations, without personal attacks or requests for irrelevant citations.

4. Confidentiality and responsible assessment

Unpublished manuscripts and associated material are confidential. Reviewers must not use them for their own research, share them without authorisation, or upload them into external AI services that may expose their contents. Editors should assess the substance of reports rather than counting recommendations. Conflicting reviews may require additional expertise or a reasoned editorial judgement.

5. Decisions and revisions

Possible outcomes include rejection, a request for revision, or acceptance after concerns are resolved. Authors should answer comments point by point and explain any disagreement with evidence. Editors make the final scholarly decision independently of payment. Review duration depends on the case and reviewer availability; no fixed completion time is guaranteed. Procedural concerns may be raised through the complaints policy.

6. Applying this policy

This document sets out the editorial rules adopted for AGM Journal. Read it with the author guidelines and related handbook policies. A policy describes the responsibilities expected of participants; it does not establish membership of an external organisation, a certification, or a guarantee of acceptance. Where an individual case falls outside the examples given here, the editorial office should explain the applicable rule and record the reason for its decision.

7. Questions and accountability

Contact the editorial office at editorial@agmjurnal.uz with the article title, submission reference, the policy section, and your question. Provide supporting information without unnecessarily identifying research participants. The office should identify who can consider the matter and request clarification where necessary. Material changes to these rules should be reflected in a new document version. Keep your submission's policy version; earlier commitments should be assessed against the information originally supplied.

Guidance and references

COPE — Core practices

<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>

DOAJ / COPE / OASPA / WAME — Transparency and best practice

<https://doaj.org/apply/transparency/>

Electronic edition information



Check document version

Version: 1.0.0
Revision date: 2026-10-13
SHA-256:
ed69f460eabbefcf4f95bdb380ceffceacbe835fb90f88d4c10ac7197daae5
29



ELECTRONIC EDITION