



Guidelines for guest editors

The following text is intended to help guest editors process submissions of special issues effectively and appropriately, and to inform authors who wish to monitor the review procedure. Guest editors are not expected to follow the guidelines strictly and are invited to suggest changes. The editors reserve the right to change published procedures without notice to deal with unexpected situations.

The evaluation procedure is similar to that used by other peer-review journals in diverse disciplines and is no more or less strict than a typical procedure. JIMS is unusual in only one respect: unlike most journals, JIMS publishes all details of the peer-review procedure, because transparency promotes fairness, which ultimately promotes academic quality.

Steps in the review procedure

1. Submission. The first author emails a submission in JIMS format (see template) to the guest editor. Note that first authors of articles in special issues are generally invited to submit on the basis of a conference presentation, but invitation does not imply acceptance: JIMS reserves the right to reject invited submissions in accordance with the recommendations of anonymous expert reviewers.

2. Preliminary evaluation. The guest editor makes a first evaluation of the submission's general academic quality and either accepts it for further processing or recommends to the academic and administrative editors that it be rejected without review.

3. Appointment of reviewers. The guest editor approaches leading international colleagues corresponding to the submission's two main disciplines (i.e. not necessarily corresponding to the headings of the background sections). The reviewers should hold doctoral degrees; represent humanities and sciences (one each); and be currently active in directly relevant research. Guest editors may find potential reviewers in the submission's reference list, but should not limit their search to that list. The guest editor initially sends the abstract to potential reviewers and checks that there is no conflict of interest. Colleagues who accept the invitation to review then receive the full submission and review guidelines.

4. Evaluation of reviews by guest editor. The guest editor checks that the reviews conform to the journal's aims and guidelines. If not, s/he returns them to the reviewers with a request for revision. If both reviewers recommend rejection, the guest editor drafts a letter of rejection to the first author. If one of the reviewers recommends acceptance and the other rejection, the guest editor forwards the manuscript to a third reviewer who represents the same discipline as the reviewer who recommended rejection. The third reviewer receives no information about previous reviews. If the third reviewer independently recommends rejection, the guest editor drafts a letter of rejection to the first author. If the third reviewer recommends acceptance, the guest editor drafts a letter to the first author that informs her/him that the submission will be accepted when s/he responds constructively to all three reviews and revises the manuscript accordingly.

5. Check of reviews by academic editor. The guest editor drafts a cover letter that includes acceptance or rejection of the submission. The guest editor then sends the draft cover letter and reviews and to the academic editor, who checks that they are appropriate and comply with the aims and guidelines of the journal. If not, s/he suggests revisions.

6. Return of reviews to first author. The guest editor sends the cover letter and reviews to the first author, with a copy to the reviewers and the academic editor.

7. Revision of manuscript. If the submission is accepted, the first author revises the manuscript, documenting all revisions that follow from comments by the guest editor and reviewers in a cover letter (see [submission guidelines](#)). S/he then sends the revised manuscript and cover letter to the guest editor.

8. Evaluation of revisions. The guest editor forwards cover letter to the reviewers. If one or more reviewers indicate/s that one or more important comments has/have not been adequately addressed, the guest editor asks the authors for a further revision. If one or more reviewer/s feel/s that most comments have been ignored or inadequately addressed, the guest editor may reject the submission. The guest editor checks that all comments have been addressed satisfactorily and the manuscript is correctly formatted for publication. If not, s/he requests further revision. When satisfied, s/he forwards the revised manuscript including replies to the reviewers' comments to the administrative editor.

9. Preparation of galley proofs. The administrative editor checks all documents and informs the guest editor of any problem. S/he then has galley proofs prepared and forwards these to the guest editor.

10. Galley proof check by first author. The guest editor forwards the proofs to the first author for a final check before the manuscript goes to press.



Record of dates

Guest editors are asked to keep a separate record of the dates of the most important emails sent during the review procedure. Please fill in the following table and send it to the administrative editor on completion of the review process.

Action	Date
Initial submission to guest editor*	
Manuscript to reviewers	
Reviews and cover to first author, preliminary acceptance	
Revised manuscript to guest editor	
Final acceptance to first author*	

*These dates will be published