



DNC Online

Peer-review Policies

Peer-review Policies

Table of Contents

1. General Policies.....	2
2. Manuscript Submission.....	2
3. Peer-review Process.....	2
3.1 General peer-review.....	2
3.2 Manuscript revision.....	2
3.3 Production preparation.....	3
4. Reviewer selection.....	3

1. General Policies

The journal “Discontinuity, Nonlinearity, and Complexity” (DNC) adopts the traditional blind-review policy in which the reviewers’ names are concealed for submission author(s) for free submission. Each submitted manuscript is reviewed by two or more referees in appropriate research fields. In addition, the editorial board members’ recommendation or established experts’ recommendation publication are welcome.

2. Manuscript Submission

For a manuscript submitted to DNC for publication, the following guidelines should be for the authors to follow.

- From the journal aims and scope, authors should follow manuscript requirements to prepare papers.
- Authors should clearly state that the paper submitted to DNC has not been considered fully and partially for publication in any of the other journals previously and currently.
- If a manuscript has several authors, one of them should be designated as a corresponding author to receive and respond to correspondence from the editors.

3. Peer-review Process

The traditional blind peer-review process has the following steps.

3.1 General peer-review

Usually, two or more referees are selected by the editors for each manuscript. In general, the peer-review should be completed in six months, and the peer-review reports should be obtained. The peer-review report should follow the following rules.

- The peer-review reports should be written in a professional manner.
- Peer-review reports are advisory to the editors for making a decision, and generally passed to the corresponding author.
- If a paper is clearly unsuitable for DNC, such a paper might be rejected without any external review.

3.2 Manuscript revision

The following guidelines for manuscript revision and peer-reviews are given for editors, associate editors and authors to follow.

- Any resubmission of revised papers should be accompanied by a summary of the changes made, and brief responses to all comments. The rebuttal material written in a professional manner will

normally be forwarded to reviewers. Remarks and issues that authors wish to address solely to the editors should be separated with the rebuttal material.

- The author should direct his or her responses to the items raised in the peer-review report.
- A revised manuscript may be sent to additional referees if necessary.
- Papers are accepted for publication from positive recommendations by the referee(s). If necessary, the editors may obtain additional opinions to arrive to an editorial decision.

3.3 Production preparation

The following guidelines for production preparation are given for authors to follow.

- After accepted, the authors should follow the journal template to prepare final version for publication. The final version with the corresponding signed copyright form and the publication option form should be submitted to the L&H Scientific Publishing LLC for production.
- Once the proofreading of manuscript is received from the typesetting, the authors should complete the correction of the proofreading in 48 hours.

4. Reviewer Selection

All submissions for publication consideration are first assessed by the Editor. After an initial assessment, manuscripts might be sent out for peer-review by independent and anonymous referees. The referees are selected from the General Guidelines for reviewer selection as in the DNC Bylaws of Editorial Policies and Practices. For manuscript peer-review, the selection of peer-review referees should follow the following rules:

- Potential reviewers must be selected by the editors or associate editors.
- Potential reviewers should be active researchers with a good understanding of materials for reviewing in the corresponding research topics.

The guidelines for new reviewer selections in the review systems are given as follows.

- A new reviewer should be nominated by editorial board members or established scientists.
- A nominated new reviewer must satisfy the following requirements.
 - S/he should have a Ph.D. degree with over two years research experience in the related fields
 - S/he must be familiar with current research topics, including over two recent publications, review experiences for other journals.
- The nominated new reviewers getting into the submission system must be approved by the Journal editors and associate editors.