

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

Journal of BioScience and Biotechnology is an open access journal that publishes original full-length research articles and invited reviews in various areas of the biological sciences (cellular and molecular biology, biochemistry, biotechnology, immunology, microbiology, virology, animal sciences, plant sciences, ecology and ecotoxicology, genetics, biomedical sciences, computational biology, biological anthropology and biological education). The editor may invite survey reviews or mini-reviews concerning recent development in particular areas of interest. All manuscript submissions are peer-reviewed before being accepted for publication by at least two independent reviewers who are either members of the Editorial Board or *ad hoc* referees. Editors and reviewers will treat all submitted manuscripts in strict confidence.

Manuscripts should be submitted **online** at <http://editorial.uni-plovdiv.bg/index.php/JBB/>

For your submission, we recommend you to upload the entire manuscript, including tables and figures, as a single PDF file. You will be invited to submit in the system also the following individual files: (1) the submission as an editable text in MS Word (.doc, .docx or .rtf) format and (2) publication-quality figures (in .EPS; .BMP; .JPG; .TIFF; .GIF or .PDF format, minimum 300 dpi). Please note that PowerPoint files are not accepted. The revisions of the manuscript should be uploaded in MS Word format.

Submissions must be accompanied by a **cover letter** from the principal/corresponding author, on behalf of all the co-authors to confirm that the manuscript (or any part of it) has not been previously published in any language anywhere and that it is not under simultaneous consideration or in press by another journal. The cover letter should clearly describe the questions addressed or hypotheses tested, the significance of the study, and how this contribution is of interest to a broad audience.

Authors are requested to provide the names and e-mail addresses of four researchers of recognized competence in the field who may be considered as referees. The choice of referees will however remain with the editorial board.

Manuscripts should be written in good English. This is the responsibility of the authors, not the editors. Manuscripts may be returned without review if the English needs significant improvement. Such problems may be avoided and publication expedited if the authors use "grammar and spell check" software to correct basic errors, and have their manuscripts edited by an English-speaking colleague or a professional editing service before the initial submission.

Journal of BioScience and Biotechnology follows the **ICMJE Recommendations** for the Biomedical Journals (<http://www.icmje.org>)

It is essential that authors prepare their manuscripts according to the instructions and specifications presented below.

ORGANIZATION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

All parts of the manuscript should be type-written (font size 12), double-spaced with margins of 2.5 cm. Pages should be numbered consecutively throughout the manuscript.

Articles should be organized into the following parts in the order indicated:

- Title page [Title; Author's name(s); Affiliation(s); Address(es)]
- Abstract
- Keywords
- Introduction
- Materials and Methods
- Results
- Discussion
- Acknowledgments (if applicable)
- References
- Figure Legends and Table Captions
- Tables
- Figures
- Supplemental data (if applicable)

Each of these parts is detailed below.

For more information see:

<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/manuscript-preparation>

Title

The title must be concise but informative, as it is frequently used for subject indexing. It should not include abbreviations or chemical formulas. Please also provide a running title of no more than 60 characters.

Authors, affiliations and addresses

Authors should be listed by full first name and full last name (e.g.: David Backer). Indicate the location at which the research was conducted (laboratory, department, institute, university, city, country). To indicate the affiliations of different authors to different institutions, use numbers in superscripts after each author's name and before the corresponding department or institution. One of the authors should be designated as the corresponding author. Indicate

the full name of the author to whom correspondence should be sent as well as his/her e-mail, telephone and fax numbers.

Abstract

The Abstract should be a brief summary of the significant items of the main paper. It should mention the techniques used without going into methodological detail and summarize the most important results and conclusions. It should not contain literature citations and abbreviations. Remember that the Abstract is what the browsing reader first consults. A comprehensive and well-written abstract will attract a reader to consult the full paper. An abstract should not normally exceed 250 words.

Keywords

Provide three to six keywords to allow the paper to be appropriately indexed. These terms should appear below the abstract, on the same page. Single words or composite terms may be used (e.g.: antigen presenting cells, T-cell hybridomas, collagen, *Rattus norvegicus*).

INTRODUCTION

Provide an adequate background, avoiding a detailed literature survey or a summary of the results. If there are relevant controversies or disagreements in the field, they should be mentioned so that a non-expert reader can delve into these issues further. The introduction should conclude with a brief statement of the overall aim of the experiments.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This section should provide enough detail for reproduction of the findings. Previously published procedures should be cited in References and only truly new procedures or modifications of previously published procedures should be described in detail. For special materials and equipment, the manufacturer's name and, if possible, location should be provided. Studies involving human and animal subjects must have been approved by the authors' institutional review board or equivalent committee and that board named by the authors. In the case of human subjects, informed consent must have been obtained and all clinical investigation must have been conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki. The use of standardized nomenclature in all fields of biology is an essential step toward the integration and linking of experimental data reported in published literature. The Methods section should also include precise information on the statistical analyses performed. Indicate the manner in which results are expressed (means, \pm SDs or SEMs; or medians and ranges or confidence limits); whether parametric (chi-square, Student's t-tests, ANOVA) or nonparametric (Man-Whitney, Kruskal-Wallis, Wilcoxon, Friedman, Quade, Kolmogorov-Smirnoff) tests were used, correlation coefficients (Pearson's product-moment or Spearman's rank) were employed, etc.

RESULTS

Results should be presented in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important

findings first. Do not repeat all the data in the tables or illustrations in the text; emphasize or summarize only the most important observations. Extra or supplementary materials and technical detail can be placed in an appendix where they will be accessible but will not interrupt the flow of the text. The section may be divided into subsections, each with a concise subheading. The results section should be written in past tense.

DISCUSSION

This section should be focused on the interpretation of the results avoiding a repetition of the Results section. The discussion should spell out the major conclusions of the work along with some explanation or speculation on the significance of these conclusions. How do the conclusions affect the existing assumptions and models in the field? How can future research build on these observations? What are the key experiments that must be done? The discussion should be concise and tightly argued.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements should include all sources of institutional, private and corporate funding of the work. Any potential conflicts of interest should be noted.

REFERENCES

Only published articles or accepted manuscripts should be included in the reference list. Meetings abstracts, conference talks, or papers that have been submitted but not yet accepted should not be cited. In the text, citations should be indicated in parentheses using the following forms for one, two, or more than two authors: (Yamada, 2011); (Steiner & Chang, 2011); (Ivanov et al., 2011). Multiple citations by the same author(s) in the same year should be distinguished by the addition of a, b, c, etc. (Liu et al. 2009a, 2009b). Multiple citations by different authors should be listed by year, then alphabetical: (Hashimoto et al., 1989; Ahlqvist, 2005; Priya & Uma, 2011).

References should be listed in alphabetical and chronological order, according to the last name of the first author, in the following sequence: one author, two authors, three or more authors. Please use the following style for the reference list:

Sample journal citation

Andersson IE, Batsalova T, Dzhambazov B, Edvinsson L, Holmdahl R, Kihlberg J, Linusson A. 2010. Oxazole-modified glycopeptides that target arthritis-associated class II MHC A(q) and DR4 proteins. *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, 8(13): 2931-2940.

Sample book citation

Whitton BA, Potts M. 2000. Ecology of cyanobacteria: Their diversity in time and space. – Kluwer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Sample chapter-in-book citation

Kuiper-Goodman T, Falconer I, Fitzgerald J. 1999. Human health aspects. – In: Chorus I. & Bartram J. (eds), *Toxic Cyanobacteria in Water: A Guide to Their Public Health*

Consequences, Monitoring, and Management, E & FN Spoon, London, p. 113-153.

FIGURE LEGENDS AND TABLE CAPTIONS

Should contain sufficient details to make the figure or table easily understood, thus be as explanatory as possible. Figures and tables should be numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals in the order of appearance in the text (Figure 1, Figure 2, Table 1).

TABLES

Each table should have an explanatory caption, which should be as concise as possible. As a rule, tables should be made without vertical lines and should be provided in an editable format i.e. in Word and not as graphic files pasted into Word. Each table must be referred to in the text as, e.g., Table 1 or (Table 1). The same data should not be given in both tables and figures. Tables occupying more than one printed page should be avoided, if possible.

FIGURES

The figures should be clear, easy to read and of good quality. Each figure, or group of figures, should be planned to fit into the area of either one or two columns of text. The maximum finished size of a one-column and two-column illustration is 8 x 23 cm and 17 x 23 cm, respectively. Scanned line drawings must be saved in black-white mode (not RGB colour) at 600 DPI. Morphological illustrations should include a scale bar.

Lettering should be of suitable size with capitals at least 1.8 mm in height after reduction for printing. Small photographs should be trimmed, eliminating unnecessary parts and grouped into composite figures. Colour plates can be published at the author's expense only; please consult with the Editorial Office for the actual colour charges. There is no colour charge for the electronic version of the article. After acceptance, the authors may be asked to supply with the figures prepared as JPG, GIF, TIF and/or EPS files at the resolution suitable for printing. Figure files should not exceed 10 MB (average size is about 2 MB).

Manipulation of images is strongly discouraged and all figures must accurately reflect the original data. Information should not be enhanced, eliminated, added, obscured or moved. In cases where manipulation is unavoidable, this should be clearly detailed in the Figure legend. Unacceptable manipulation includes, but is not limited to, the enhancement of one feature/band over others, removal of background noise/bands and so on. Authors must be able to produce all data in their raw format upon editorial request.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Authors can also submit supplemental figures and tables that support the interpretation and conclusions drawn in the manuscript. Supplemental Data can be submitted as separate files from the rest of the manuscript in any of the usual formats (PDF, MS Word, GIF, TIFF, etc.). Legends or short explanations must accompany all supplemental data.

ABBREVIATIONS AND NOMENCLATURE

The use of standardized abbreviations and nomenclature in all fields of biology is an essential step toward the integration and linking of scientific information reported in published literature. The authors should follow internationally agreed rules. Use only standard abbreviations. Nonstandard abbreviations should be defined when first used in the text. The abbreviations of some compounds, e.g. DNA, RNA, NADH, ATP etc., and amino acids in proteins, are not necessary to define. Measurements of length, height, weight, and volume should be reported in metric units. Species names should be italicized (e.g. *Empis rustica*, *Anabaena solitaria*, *Haberlea rhodopensis*). Genes, mutations, genotypes and alleles should be indicated in *italics*. Use the recommended name by consulting the appropriate nomenclature database.

PROOFS

PDF proofs sent by e-mail to the authors must be returned within 48 hours to the editorial office. Delayed dispatch of corrected proofs will delay publication. In order to minimize the corrections and alterations in the proof stage, authors are requested to prepare the manuscript carefully according to the guidelines before submitting it for publication.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES

Submission of a manuscript to *Journal of BioScience and Biotechnology* implies that all authors have read and agreed to its content, and that any experimental research that is reported in the manuscript has been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee. All experiments on live vertebrates or higher invertebrates must be performed in accordance with these relevant institutional and national guidelines and regulations. Manuscripts containing information related to human or animal use should clearly state that the research has complied with all relevant national guidelines and institutional policies. Copies of these guidelines and policy statements must be available for review by the Editor if necessary.

Research carried out on humans must be in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration

(<http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html>). A statement to this effect must appear in the Methods section of the manuscript, including the name of the body, which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate. Informed consent must also be documented. Manuscripts may be rejected if the editorial office considers that the research has not been carried out within an ethical framework, e.g. if the severity of the experimental procedure is not justified by the value of the knowledge gained.

AUTHORSHIP AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The **authorship** should be based on the following 4 criteria:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND

4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part are appropriately investigated and resolved.

All designated as authors should meet all four criteria for authorship, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who do not meet all four criteria should be acknowledged individually or together as a group under a single heading (e.g. "Clinical Investigators" or "Participating Investigators"), and their contributions should be specified (e.g., "served as scientific advisors," "critically reviewed the study proposal," "collected data," "provided and cared for study patients", "participated in writing or technical editing of the manuscript"). The criteria are not intended for use as a means to disqualify colleagues from authorship who otherwise meet authorship criteria by denying them the opportunity to meet criterion #s 2 or 3. Therefore, all individuals who meet the first criterion should have the opportunity to participate in the review, drafting, and final approval of the manuscript.

It is the collective responsibility of the authors, not the journal to which the work is submitted, to determine that all people named as authors meet all four criteria; it is not the role of journal editors to determine who qualifies or does not qualify for authorship or to arbitrate authorship conflicts. If agreement cannot be reached about who qualifies for authorship, the institution(s) where the work was performed, not the journal editor, should be asked to investigate. If authors request removal or addition of an author after manuscript submission or publication, journal editors should seek an explanation and signed statement of agreement for the requested change from all listed authors and from the author to be removed or added.

The corresponding author is the one individual who takes primary responsibility for communication with the journal during the manuscript submission, peer review, and publication process, and typically ensures that all the journal's administrative requirements, such as providing details of authorship, ethics committee approval, clinical trial registration documentation, and gathering conflict of interest forms and statements, are properly completed, although these duties may be delegated. The corresponding author should be available throughout the submission and peer review process to respond to editorial queries in a timely way, and should be available after publication to respond to critiques of the work and cooperate with any requests from the journal for data or additional information should questions about the paper arise after publication.

Publication and authorship

1. All submitted papers are subject to strict peer-review process by at least two international reviewers that are experts in the area of the particular paper.
2. The factors that are taken into account in review are relevance, soundness, significance, originality, readability and language.
3. The possible decisions include acceptance, acceptance with revisions, or rejection.

4. If authors are encouraged to revise and resubmit a submission, there is no guarantee that the revised submission will be accepted.

5. Rejected articles will not be re-reviewed.

6. The paper acceptance is constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.

7. No research can be included in more than one publication.

Authors' responsibilities

1. Authors must certify that their manuscripts are their original work.
2. Authors must certify that the manuscript has not previously been published elsewhere.
3. Authors must certify that the manuscript is not currently being considered for publication elsewhere.
4. Authors must participate in the peer review process.
5. Authors are obliged to provide retractions or corrections of mistakes.
6. All Authors mentioned in the paper must have significantly contributed to the research.
7. Authors must state that all data in the paper are real and authentic.
8. Authors must notify the Editors of any conflicts of interest.
9. Authors must identify all sources used in the creation of their manuscript.
10. Authors must report any errors they discover in their published paper to the Editors.

Reviewers' responsibilities

1. Reviewers should keep all information regarding papers confidential and treat them as privileged information.
2. Reviews should be conducted objectively, with no personal criticism of the author
3. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments
4. Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors.
5. Reviewers should also call to the Editor in Chief's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.
6. Reviewers should not review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

Editors' responsibilities

1. Editors have complete responsibility and authority to reject/accept an article.
2. Editors are responsible for the contents and overall quality of the publication.
3. Editors should always consider the needs of the authors and the readers when attempting to improve the publication.
4. Editors should guarantee the quality of the papers and the integrity of the academic record.
5. Editors should publish errata pages or make corrections when needed.

6. Editors should have a clear picture of a research's funding sources.
7. Editors should base their decisions solely on the papers' importance, originality, clarity and relevance to publication's scope.
8. Editors should not reverse their decisions nor overturn the ones of previous editors without serious reason.
9. Editors should preserve the anonymity of reviewers.
10. Editors should ensure that all research material they publish conforms to internationally accepted ethical guidelines.
11. Editors should only accept a paper when reasonably certain.
12. Editors should act if they suspect misconduct, whether a paper is published or unpublished, and make all reasonable attempts to persist in obtaining a resolution to the problem.
13. Editors should not reject papers based on suspicions, they should have proof of misconduct.
14. Editors should not allow any conflicts of interest between staff, authors, reviewers and board members.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

The Editor-in-Chief initially assesses the appropriateness of each submitted manuscript for publication. Manuscripts which fall outside the journal's scope or are substandard in respects of non-merit reasons (presentation, style, technical aspects) may be declined without a review. The Editor-in-Chief appoints an Editor with expertise in the relevant field, who is fully responsible for further handling the manuscript and an ultimate decision about its acceptance/rejection. The Editor initially evaluates the originality and potential impact of the work. Manuscripts deemed unsuitable (work incomplete, inconclusive, merely confirmatory, with scientific or methodological flaws, of insufficient originality or limited interest to a general biological audience) are returned to the author(s) without detailed review. Manuscripts that meet editorial criteria for content and minimum quality standard are rigorously vetted by external expert reviewers recruited by the Editor. Authors are encouraged to suggest names of potential referees though there is no agreement that the manuscript should necessarily be sent to them; the final selection of reviewers remains a prerogative of the Editors. Editors and reviewers are requested to treat all submitted manuscripts in strict confidence. The authors' names are revealed to the referees, but not vice versa. The articles are reviewed by a minimum of two reviewers.

The reviewers make an objective, impartial evaluation of scientific merits of the manuscript. Reviewers are asked to comment on the following aspects of the submitted manuscripts:

- novelty and originality of the work;
- broad interest to the community of researchers;
- significance to the field, potential impact of the work, conceptual or methodological advances described;
- study design and clarity;
- substantial evidence supporting claims and

conclusions;

- rigorous methodology.

The primary criteria for judging the acceptability of a manuscript are its originality, scientific importance and interest to a general biological audience. If a manuscript is believed to not meet the standards of the journal or is otherwise lacking in scientific rigor or contains major deficiencies, the reviewers will attempt to provide constructive criticism to assist the authors in ultimately improving their work. If a manuscript is believed to be potentially acceptable for publication but needs to be improved, it is invited for reconsideration with the expectation that the authors will fully address the reviewer's suggestions.

Once all reviews have been received and considered by the Editor, a decision letter to the author is drafted. There are several types of decisions possible:

- Accept without revision
- Minor revision
- Major revision
- Reject.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In order to encourage transparency without impeding publication, all authors, referees and editors must declare any association that poses a conflict of interest in connection with the manuscript.

Authors should declare whether they have any conflicts of interests that could have influenced the reporting of the experimental data or conclusions in their paper. Such a statement should list all potential interests or, if appropriate, should clearly state that there are none. The editors may decide not to publish papers when we believe the competing interests are such that they may have compromised the work or the analyses or interpretations presented. Upon submission of a manuscript, authors may suggest to exclude any specific editors or reviewers from the peer review of their article. It is the responsibility of authors to disclose in the Acknowledgments section any funding sources for the project or other relationships that are relevant.

Editors should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication. If needed, other appropriate action should be taken, such as the publication of a retraction or expression of concern. Editor who believes that the conflict will preclude an impaired judgment should disclose the nature of the conflict and decline to handle the paper.

Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscripts. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research

without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

COPYRIGHT

Authors of articles published in *Journal of BioScience and Biotechnology* retain the copyright of their articles. The journal/publisher is not responsible for subsequent uses of the

work. It is the author's responsibility to bring an infringement action if so desired by the author.