

International Journal of Plasma Environmental Science and Technology

Peer-review Policy

Peer-review is the evaluation process of manuscript by one or multiple experts in the relevant field. Unbiased evaluation is imperative for all manuscripts submitted regardless of gender, religious belief, race, nationality, age or reputation of the authors. The peer-review is an essential step to decide whether the manuscript can be published or not. Please see the below for more information.

- Authors should submit a manuscript or revisions of manuscripts in digital format through the online submission (ScholarOne Manuscript), which can be hyperlinked from the IJPEST webpage by clicking “Paper Submission” button. Hardcopy manuscripts or email submissions are not accepted.
- When a new manuscript is submitted to IJPEST, the editorial office conducts pre-evaluation checks about the format, journal scope, ethical issue, and English before sending it to an editor-in-chief (EIC). Article that has serious problems with these criteria may be rejected at this stage.
- The authors should provide a “cover letter” by either type it or upload to the submission system.
- Among several different types in the review process, IJPEST operates the “single-blind review”, in which the reviewers know the name and affiliation of authors but the reviewers are anonymous to the authors.
- The EIC evaluate the manuscript whether it fits the requirements for publication. If not, the EIC may reject the manuscript without transferring to the editor and the reviewers.
- The EIC assign editor, who is a professional on the work.
- The assigned editor invites reviewers by considering the possible reviewers recommended by the authors and experts in the field.
- Reviewers should evaluate objectively the scientific quality of the manuscript. Reviewers can point out relevant publications that is not cited in the manuscript.
- If the reviewer’s opinion is divided, then the editor can invite third reviewer (often a member of the editorial board).
- The editors and the reviewers should return comments and suggestions within the time allocated by the online review system.
- The editor-in-chief inform corresponding author about the decision with the detailed the comments provided by reviewers. Review feedback is not the only factor in the decision, but it is certainly a significant factor. The decision will be either of “accept”, “minor revision requiring no re-review”, “minor revision requiring re-review”, “major revision”, or “reject”.
- When authors submit a revised manuscript, they should carefully reflect the comments raised by the editor and the reviewers. The revised manuscript should include main body (text, figures, and tables), a list of changes, and item-by-item response to all comments.

- The authors can provide scientific rebuttal to the comments that you disagree with.
- A reviewer should inform the editor if the assigned manuscript contains substantial similarity to the any published paper.
- The comments of reviewers should return to the editor without contacting authors directly.
- The time records of submission and peer-review will appear on the published paper: received, revised, accepted, published online.