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1.1 AAPS PharmSciTech Overview and Scope

*AAPS PharmSciTech* is an online-only journal committed to serving those pharmaceutical scientists and engineers interested in the research, development, and evaluation of pharmaceutical dosage forms, including drugs derived from biotechnology and the manufacturing science pertaining to the commercialization of such dosage forms. Because of its electronic nature, *AAPS PharmSciTech* aspires to utilize evolving electronic technology to enable faster and diverse mechanisms of information delivery to its readership.

**Impact Factor:** 1.776 (2013) *
*2013 Journal Citation Reports, Thomson Reuters

**Abstracted/Indexed in:**
Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS), EMBASE, Google Scholar, IBIDS, Index Copernicus, International Pharmaceutical Abstracts, Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, OCLC, PubMed/Medline, PubMedCentral, Science Citation Index Expanded (SciSearch), SCOPUS, Summon by Serial Solutions

**Copublisher/Distribution Rights**
American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists
[www.springer.com/biomed/pharmaceutical+science/journal/12249](http://www.springer.com/biomed/pharmaceutical+science/journal/12249)
1.2 AAPS PharmSciTech Contact Information

Editor-in-Chief:

Robert O. (Bill) Williams III, Ph.D.
University of Texas at Austin
bill.williams@austin.utexas.edu
+1.512.471.4681

AAPS Editorial Office

American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists
2107 Wilson Blvd., Suite 700
Arlington, VA 22201-3042
Fax: +1.703.243.9532

Todd Reitzel
Director of Publications
ReitzelT@aaps.org
+1.703.248.4760

Catherine Abbott
Publications Manager
AbbottC@aaps.org
+1.703.248.4762

Kristen Iovino
Journals Editorial Assistant, contracted
AAPSPT@aaps.org

General AAPS PharmSciTech inquiry inbox
AAPSPT@aaps.org
1.3 AAPS PhaRMSciTech Publisher Information

AAPS PhaRMSciTech
ISSN: 1530-9932 (electronic version)
Journal no. 12249
Springer Science + Business Media, LLC

About Springer
Partner for Research and Practice

Knowledge, information and quality—these are the three things that shape Springer Science+Business Media’s business activities. We develop, manage, and disseminate knowledge through books, journals, and the Internet. We work with the world’s best academics and authors in long-standing loyal partnerships based on mutual trust, and we are always open to new input.

We aim to offer excellence—more than 150 Nobel prize-winners have published with Springer to date. Many of our publications are considered authoritative works in their field, read by academics and students, used by libraries and universities, academic professionals and practitioners in various branches of industry.

http://www.springer.com/about+springer?SGWID=0-104-0-0-0
1.4 \textit{AAPS PharmSciTech} Editorial Advisory Board
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1.5 AAPS eJOURNAL EDITOR CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

All AAPS ejournal editors are required to agree and adhere to the following confidentiality statement:

As editor of an AAPS ejournal, I will keep confidential all content of submitted manuscripts. I also agree to maintain both the privacy and intellectual property rights of authors who submit to an AAPS ejournal.

I will not disclose any information regarding a submission, including but not limited to its content and all reviewer comments other than discussions with the journal’s editors, editorial advisory board members, and reviewers in relation to the peer-review process.

AAPS JOURNALS ETHICS POLICY

The editors-in-chief of the two ejournals of AAPS—The AAPS Journal and AAPS PharmSciTech—along with the AAPS Publications Committee—developed an integrated ethics policy to guide decision-making across the two journals. The document is based on recommendations on publication ethics policies for medical journals that the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) published. These policies are posted at www.wame.org/resources/ethics-resources, and almost 1,000 journals subscribe to these policies.

Editors for the AAPS ejournals agree to both read and operate under the AAPS ethical guidelines as stated in the AAPS Journals Ethics Policy.
AAPS members may access full article content for The AAPS Journal, AAPS PharmSciTech, and Pharmaceutical Research through www.PhrmaGateway.net. Users must have an active AAPS membership to access full content.

Members may sign-in to this portal using their current AAPS member ID and password by clicking on “Sign In” located on the upper left corner of the home page. Upon sign-in, the member name should appear next to “Sign Out” in the upper left-hand corner of the home page.

If the member name does not appear or an error message is displayed, there may be an issue with the individual’s AAPS membership, ID, and/or password, which the AAPS Membership Department should be able to resolve. Please direct the member to the AAPS Membership Department at membership@aaps.org or +1.703.243.2800.
2.1 **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The editor-in-chief (EIC) shall be responsible for the oversight of the scientific quality and scope, as well as the operational policies and management facets of the journal. These include, but are not limited to, directing the timely solicitation, evaluation, selection, and editing of manuscripts and other materials to be published in the journal.

Several major duties of the EIC are enumerated below:

- The EIC should work with the AAPS Publications Committee and the AAPS director of publications to establish general editorial guidelines and policies.

- The EIC is responsible for the appointment and supervision of other editors, including associate editors, assistant editors, and guest editors.

- The EIC shall serve as the chair of the journal's editorial advisory board, which shall include all associate and assistant editors, as well as EIC appointees. From time to time, the EIC may discontinue the appointment of existing EAB members and make new appointments. The size of the EAB is at the EIC’s discretion and is subject to agreement of the AAPS director of publications.

- The EIC shall manage the day-to-day operations of the journals, including the Editorial Manager peer-review process.

- The EIC shall work with AAPS editorial staff to monitor and improve standard operating procedures, as well as ensure the journal editorial policies are being enforced.

- AAPS editorial staff shall coordinate the collection of copyright transfer agreements as well as all necessary permissions to include copyrighted material by others from each author/contributor to the journal. The EIC shall provide assistance when requested by the editorial office staff, for delinquent collection of these forms and permissions.

- The EIC shall work with AAPS staff and leadership and other journal editors to identify articles of public interest for publication in the journal.

- The EIC shall address problems in a timely manner, including but not limited to allegations of misconduct as outlined in the AAPS Journals Ethics policy.

- The EIC is obligated to conduct the editorial operations of the journal within the overall budget set forth in the contractual agreement between the EIC and AAPS.
• The EIC may appoint support staff, including assistant editors and editorial assistants, as may be required to maintain the prompt, orderly administration of editorial operations and to maintain the high quality of scientific content of the journal. Such appointments should be consistent with AAPS and applicable institutional policies for employment.

• The EIC shall report to the AAPS Publications Committee at least once annually regarding journal editorial operations and shall make additional reports to the committee when the committee or AAPS Executive Council requests.

• The EIC shall attend the AAPS Annual Meeting and Exposition each year and participate in the Publications Committee meeting, the journal’s EAB meeting, etc., if such meetings are called.
2.2 ASSOCIATE EDITOR ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The editor-in-chief (EIC) appoints an associate editor (AE) based on the AE’s area of expertise and his/her anticipated contributions to the journal’s scientific content and quality.

AE’s responsibilities may, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- The AE serves as an advisor to the EIC regarding all scientific and operational aspects of the journal.

- The AE is responsible for managing the evaluation of certain submitted manuscripts that the EIC assigns. This will include soliciting a suitable number of outside knowledgeable reviewers (based on an evaluation of their credentials) and adding these reviewers to the Editorial Manager (EM) manuscript tracking system, monitoring the quality and timeliness of the submitted reviews, and submitting an editorial recommendation to the EIC. The AE should not convey any editorial decisions directly to an author. Timely handling of such manuscripts is of essence.

- Monitor and update the reviewer database to incorporate additional classifications, change of affiliation, or contact venues.

- Flagging of authors within EM who have had submissions triaged for plagiarism.

- The AE must familiarize her/himself with the operational aspects of EM and conduct the review process, including recommendation to the EIC through this system. The AAPS editorial office will provide assistance as needed.

- The EIC may charge the AE to suggest articles or themes of contemporary interest and to serve as a guest editor for such materials. For the guest editor's duties, refer to the section “Guest Editor Role and Duties.”
2.3 GUEST EDITOR ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

AAPS can support more than one guest editor per theme. However, one guest editor must act as the lead (managing) guest editor (LGE) within Editorial Manager (EM). This LGE will manage the overall peer-review process for all manuscripts in the theme.

**LEAD GUEST EDITOR RESPONSIBILITIES**

- Develop theme topic and scope (please refer to the section Guidelines for Themes Published in the AAPS eJournals.

- Solicit authors to submit content to the theme.

- Submit theme details to the AAPS Editorial Office by completing the Theme Setup Information Sheet.

- Coordinate calls when necessary with any co-guest editors, the editor-in-chief (EIC), and AAPS editorial staff.

- Accept EM assignments from the EIC through EM for invited theme manuscript submissions. Invite a suitable number of reviewers. Two completed quality reviews are required for each article. The LGE or co-guest editors of the theme may act as reviewers if necessary.

- Review EM manuscript assignments from EIC of non-solicited papers, which may qualify for inclusion in the theme. Determine, along with co-guest editor(s), whether the submission should be included in the theme. If acceptable, accept the assignment and initiate the review process. If appropriate, notify the editorial office to assign/edit the section category (theme affiliation) of the submission.

- Track and manage the peer-review process within EM using the proposal tab on the main EM menu by selecting your theme title under the “View all Assigned Proposals” folder. Management of the peer-review process includes but is not necessarily limited to the following functions:
  - Accept assignments from the EIC (invited and unsolicited).
  - Invite reviewers; all co-guest editors can qualify as reviewers (AAPS–EM default requirement is a minimum of 2 quality reviews).
  - Send EM reminder letters to nonresponsive or late reviewers, as needed.
  - Invite additional reviewers as necessary.
  - When sufficient reviews have been received, uninvite any outstanding reviewer invitations and render editorial recommendation to the EIC.

- Update EIC on progress of the theme.
CO-GUEST EDITOR ROLE AND DUTIES

(If the LGE is sole editor for the theme, the LGE assumes any responsibilities in this section that are not listed above.)

- Assist the LGE with the formulation of the theme, including manuscript scope, lineup, and authors.
- Assist the LGE with solicitation of authors.
- Accept EM manuscript assignments from the LGE and conduct review of assigned manuscripts.
- If an overview or commentary of the theme is planned, work with other co-guest editors to compose and edit this article.
- Communicate with the LGE, EIC, or AAPS staff if any concern or question arises.
3.1 GUIDELINES FOR THEMES PUBLISHED IN THE AAPS eJOURNALS

1. *AAPS PharmSciTech* invites the submission and publication of themes on contemporary issues in the pharmaceutical sciences. An editor normally solicits these themes. However, the journal editors welcome unsolicited suggestions of possible themes. Please contact the editor-in-chief (EIC) to initiate a theme. Themes should be completed and published within 6 months of approval.

2. When published from symposia and workshops, the theme title should contain the official symposium/workshop title. The relevant symposium or workshop must also be referenced within the text.

3. Ordinarily, leading investigators in the field or symposia/workshop organizers guest edit themes. The journal will acknowledge such editorship appropriately. The journal’s EIC, however, will make final editorial decisions.

4. For symposia/workshop contributions, it is unnecessary for all oral presentations to result in written articles, but it is desirable to have a critical mass (not fewer than three articles) for use of the symposium/workshop title format described in item #2. If fewer than three papers are received, they may be considered individually for publication as stand-alone papers (with a footnote denoting affiliation to the symposium or workshop).

5. At the discretion of the guest editor(s) and the EIC, additional papers may be invited, if desired.

6. Each proceeding paper in the theme would ideally be in the format of a "state-of-the-art" review of at least 3,500 words (about eight manuscript pages) with suitable tables, figures and references. However, variations to this format may be made at the joint discretion of the guest editor(s) and the EIC.

7. All theme manuscripts will undergo peer-review and editorial review, consistent with the journal’s policy.

8. If appropriate, such proceedings may be considered for publication as a book, either alternatively or subsequent to journal publication.

9. Ideally, themes arising from symposia/workshops should be published within six months of the relevant meeting.

10. All theme manuscripts must be submitted online using Editorial Manager (www.editorialmanager.com/aapspt/) according to the journal’s style (see Instructions for Authors).
3.2 AAPS eJOURNALS THEME INITIATION FORM INSTRUCTIONS

Find the Theme Setup Information Sheet here: www.aaps.org/themesetup.

Initiating a **NEW** theme issue:

All requested criteria on this theme initiation page must be included to provide accurate information and data to the editor-in-chief (EIC) for his/her review and approval of the proposed theme.

**THEME INFORMATION**

- Enter the title of the proposed theme.
- Enter the author invitation response due date. The current manuscript tracking system default is set at 30 days from this initial theme submission set-up process; please allow at least 15–30 days for response to the invitation.
- Enter the author submission due date. Please allow 3–4 months following the response due date.
- Enter the target publication date. This is the estimated date on which all submissions have been published and the theme is finalized. The target date cannot be less than 75 days from the author submission due date, so as to allow for peer-review, revision, and production phases.

**THEME DESCRIPTION**

- Enter a brief theme description—this text box should contain a brief, 2–4 sentence description of the information the theme will encompass. Maximum word count is 150 words. This description will be incorporated into the theme proposal, which will be sent to all invited authors. This description will also be used for promotion of the theme issue through AAPS.

**THEME CLASSIFICATIONS**

- Please select at least three classifications for this theme from the available classifications list. Please use the directional arrows to select or remove classifications.

**KEYWORDS**

- Provide 2–5 applicable keywords for your theme.

**THEME GUEST EDITORS**

- More than one person can be co-editors of a theme; however, only one person can be the lead editor in Editorial Manager. Please provide the lead editor name first in the list of editors and/or denote which person is the lead editor. The names and spellings of the editors provided here will be used in final publication. Learn more about co-editors in [Guest Editor Role and Responsibilities](#).
AUTHORS

- Please provide names and email addresses for each of the corresponding authors per paper. Provide expected topic or title of authors’ manuscripts, if known.
- Supplemental documentation about authors to invite can be provided in Word or Excel format.
- To invite authors after the form has been submitted, contact the AAPS Editorial Office for assistance.

SUBMITTING FORM

- Once complete, please send the form to the AAPS Editorial Office at AAPSPT@aaps.org.
4.1 Editorial Manager Peer Review Workflow

Editorial Manager Peer Review Process for AAPS E-Journals

- Author submits manuscript
- Editorial Office reviews submission
- Does manuscript adhere to all submission requirements?
- Yes: EiC Assigns 2-3 Reviewers or subordinate Editors
  - Reviews Submitted
  - Reminders sent by EiCs or AAPS staff
  - Decision made: accept, reject
    - R major
    - R minor
  - EiC notified, Reviews are completed
  - Manuscript transferred to Springer production queue if copyright on file

- No: AAPS Editorial Office returns to author with instructions; author resubmits to journal office
- 1-3d
- AAPS Editorial Office Assigns to Editor-in-Chief (EiC)
- 1d-60d
- Author submits revised manuscript
- 1d-3d
- EiC reviews revision
- R minor or R major
- 1d-60d
- Decision: Accept, Revise, Reject
  - Accept
  - Reject
  - Email sent to author
  - END

- 1-60d
- EiC notified, Reviews are completed
- 1.2d
- Accepted
- 2d
- Manuscript transferred to Springer production queue if copyright on file

- 3d
- Reviews Submitted

Roles:
- AAPS Staff
- EiC/Editor
- Author
- Reviewer
4.2 Editorial Manager Editor Tutorial Access

Full access to the most recent version of the EM Editor Tutorial is available in PDF and Word formats at http://www.editorialmanager.com/homepage/resources.html.
4.3 REVIEWER GUIDELINES AND EDITORIAL MANAGER TUTORIAL

The following tips for reviewing a paper in *AAPS PharmSciTech* are provided by the editor-in-chief.

**TIPS FOR REVIEWING A PAPER SUBMITTED TO AAPS PharmSciTech**

One of the critical elements in our careers as pharmaceutical scientists is to peer review articles during the submission and publication process. We have all been asked to do this, often many times over short periods of time. It is helpful to learn the mechanics of reviewing papers in order to make the review process more efficient. This will complement your knowledge of the subject matter of the article. As peer reviewers, our role is to identify flaws and inconsistencies regarding the approach taken by the authors in addressing their research question and their knowledge of the related literature. Although our role as reviewers is not to correct extensive grammar and style problems, we can alert the editor to problems that confuse the reader.

Reviewers for *AAPS PharmSciTech* are anonymous. The editor-in-chief, after a careful triage of each submitted article, will send the submitted article typically to four reviewers or content experts. The editor checks each article submitted to *AAPS PharmSciTech* for plagiarism before sending to reviewers. Although each author can suggest to the editor the names of several reviewers particularly knowledgeable about their work and the research field, these suggested scientists should not have any conflict or appearance of a conflict that would render their review biased.

**PARTS OF A GOOD PEER REVIEW SHOULD INCLUDE:**

1. List the title of the paper and its authors.
2. Provide a short, concise summary of the paper (a few sentences) to inform the editor of your knowledge and understanding of the article's topic.
3. Summarize the positive contributions of the article. This is particularly helpful to the authors if the review is generally critical and unfavorable to publication of the article.
4. Provide your major comments about each part of the article. This includes the significance of the article's overall contribution to the field; the author's approach to study their research question; the appropriateness of the methods used in the study; the results; the arguments in the discussion section and how well the basis of the arguments are supported by literature citations; and how well the authors answered their hypothesis in the conclusion.
5. Provide your minor comments about the paper, which should include comments on the writing style, figures and tables, grammar, and particularly if these confuse the reader.
6. Provide your recommendation to the editor. Remember, *AAPS PharmSciTech* receives substantially more papers than are published, so only the very best papers are published.

**TIPS FOR REVIEWING EACH PART OF THE ARTICLE INCLUDE:**

1. Abstract: Provides a summary of the paper. It must state the research question being addressed and the conclusion. It should include key data and numerical information from the results. Abstracts rich in numerical data are the most helpful to readers. The
significance of the paper’s results must be stated. The past tense should be used (no mixed tenses).

2. Introduction: Informs the reader about the topic of the article (e.g., states the hypothesis and the research question being addressed). It should state the significance of the work. It provides a background of the research question by citing up to 5 or 6 studies from the literature. The literature review should go back in time. The cited studies should be chosen based on importance of the work (e.g., number of cites; impact factor of the journal; etc.). This section must answer the question of “Why does the reader care about the study.”

3. Materials and Methods: Provides adequate detail about the materials and techniques used such that a reader could replicate your experiments in order to assess the article’s results and conclusion. All new methods must be described in detail. If the authors are following another reported method, then those methods can be described briefly and cited.

4. Results: The Results and Discussion sections should not be combined. This section is written in past tense. The results are described in text and supplemented with figures and tables. All data should be analyzed. Only the relevant and representative data should be described.

5. Discussion: Provides the primary findings of the article, followed by the evidence to support the author’s arguments. The results must be compared and contrasted to what is in the literature. The significance of the results must be described along with the practical implications to the field. The author must state if the results of the study support their hypothesis. The phrases, such as “may have,” “might have,” and “perhaps” must be avoided. The discussion section should be about 5 to 6 pages in length. If it is shorter than about 3 pages in length, then the authors have most likely under-interpreted their results.

6. Conclusion: Provides a strong concluding sentence about the study that answers the hypothesis. The authors should present no new material in this section.

7. Citations: The authors should provide typically 40 to 50 important citations. Reviewers are encouraged to help the authors identify any additional relevant citations for inclusion in the article.

Tips for Declining to Review an Article Include:

1. Immediately respond to the editor’s invitation to review. It is OK to say “no” if you:
   a. Cannot review the article within 2-3 weeks of receipt of the invitation.
   b. You are not a content expert on the topic of the article.

2. If you decline to review an article, then please suggest alternative content experts to the editor.

Viewing, Accepting and Declining Review Invitations in Editorial Manager

- Reviewers are invited either at the discretion of the editor or at the request of the author(s). Reviewers will receive an invitation to review via email and will be asked to sign-in to Editorial Manager (EM) to accept or decline the invitation.
- Follow the link to EM from the email invitation. If the link does not work, type in www.editorialmanager.com/aapspt for AAPS PharmSciTech to access EM.
• Sign into EM with your username and password and be sure to click “Reviewer Login” after you enter your sign in information.
• On the “Reviewer Main Menu,” click “New Reviewer Invitation” to view details about the manuscript and to accept or decline the invitation to review.
• Click “View Submission” once you are in your “New Reviewer Invitations” folder. This will open a PDF version of the manuscript, where you can view the full text of the paper in addition to the abstract and keywords.
• If you would like to review the manuscript, click “Agree to Review.” If you decide not to review the manuscript, click “Decline to Review.” There will be a space for comments when you decline an assignment and, while these comments are helpful for our editors, they are not mandatory.

RECOMMENDATION OF A DECISION TO THE EDITOR

After carefully considering the manuscript, reviewers have the option of submitting a recommendation for decision to the editor. Reviewers should give as many details as possible to support their recommendation.

• Submitting a recommendation of **accept** indicates the reviewer believes the manuscript should be published in its current iteration.
• Submitting a recommendation of **revise** indicates the reviewer believes the author(s) need to revise the manuscript, either substantially or insubstantially, before it can be considered for publication. AAPS editors may issue decisions of **revise major** and **revise minor**; reviewers should indicate their preferred revision level by elaborating on a revise recommendation in the comments section.
• Submitting a recommendation of **reject** indicates the reviewer believes the manuscript should NOT be published.

SUBMITTING YOUR RECOMMENDATION IN EDITORIAL MANAGER

• Once you agree to review a manuscript, the assignment will move into your “Pending Assignments” folder on the Reviewer Main Menu. From this folder, you may “View Submission” as many times as necessary before submitting your recommendation to the editor.
• When you are ready to submit your comments, click “Submit Recommendation.” Again, it may be helpful to complete your review in a word processing program and copy and paste the information into the comments box during review submission. After clicking “Submit Recommendation,” you will be taken to the “Reviewer Recommendation and Comments” screen.
• Choose a recommendation of accept, reject, or revise from the pull-down menu and then give the manuscript an overall rating between 1 and 100.
• You may also be given a series of manuscript rating questions and asked to rate the manuscript on a scale of 1 to 5 based on those questions.
• You must now enter text into the “Reviewer Blind Comments to Author” box and the “Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor” box. The author(s) of the manuscript WILL be able to view the comments placed in the “Reviewer Blind Comments to Author” box, but
those comments will be blinded and not in any way affiliated with reviewer contact information. Comments placed in the “Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor” box will only be viewed by the editor. This box is also where reviewers must indicate any potential conflicts of interest.

- Reviewers always have the option to save their review and submit it later as well as proof and/or print their review.
- When you are ready to submit your comments, click on “Proceed.” This is your final opportunity to edit your comments. Click “Submit Review to Journal Office” when you are ready to complete your assignment.
- Reviewers will always be able to view previously submitted recommendations. Once they are submitted, all reviews are moved into the “Completed Assignments” folder on the Reviewer Main Menu, where they can be accessed at any time.
4.4 EDITORIAL MANAGER REPORTS FUNCTION

Upon sign-in to Editorial Manager (EM), scroll to the bottom of the main editorial menu page. Select “Reports” under the “Administrative Functions” section. A description of each report is listed below.

**Report Tools**

*Custom Report*: Contact the editorial office for more information.

**Status Reports**

*Current Status Report*: N/A

*Editor’s To-Do List Report*: Content includes all pending actions and decisions for a particular editor. Sections include new manuscript assignments, reviews pending, post review decisions required, revisions pending, and post revision decisions required. Select the editor whose to-do list you wish to view.

**Author Reminder Reports**

*Author Revision Status Report*: This report provides editors the option to review in report format the status of manuscripts out for revision.

*Author Revision Reminder Report*: This report provides editors the option to send reminders to authors with manuscripts out for revision. The editorial office sends weekly reminders as needed.

**Invited Author Reports**

*Proposal Pipeline Report*: This report displays all author invitations and invited submissions associated with a proposal. Select multiple criteria and the report results will be limited to those invitations and manuscripts that fulfill all the selected criteria. Incomplete proposals with unapproved PDFs and proposals with a final disposition of “Withdrawn Proposal” are automatically excluded from the results.

*Authors Invited—No Response*: This report displays author invitations that have received no response and enables editors to send reminders.

*Author Invitation Status Report*: This report displays the status of all accepted author invitations and provides editors the option to send reminders.

**Editor Reports**

*Assignment Status Report*: This report displays all submissions in the review cycle between the time the editor is assigned and the author is notified of the decision.
**New Assignments Report:** This report allows you to view all outstanding editor (including associate and guest editor) assignments and/or outstanding editor invitations and allows you to view by one or more editors.

**Required Reviews Complete Report:** This report allows the user to select report parameters and editors to view manuscripts that have the required number of reviews complete.

**Reviewer Reports**

**Reviewer Invited—No Response Report:** This report allows the user to view a list of reviewers invited to review a manuscript who have not yet responded.

**Reviewer Reminder Report:** This report allows the user to view a list of reviewers who have received reminders regarding their pending assignments.

**Reviewer Reminder Letters**

Reviewer reminder letters are automatically sent periodically throughout the review process.

**Summary and Annual Reports**

**Document Classification List Report:** This report is a list of all documents and their assigned classifications between the chosen start and end dates (based on document received date) grouped by final disposition (including <blank>).

**Reviewer Performance Report:** This report is a summary of reviewer activity for all submissions received by the journal office during the selected time period. Detailed performance statistics are provided for each reviewer, along with a link to more detailed information about each reviewer.

**Editor Performance Report:** This report is a summary of activity for all editor assignments during the selected time period. A decision summary is provided, along with turnaround time and key statistics indicating editor performance.

**Journal Accountability Report:** This report provides a detailed summary of journal office activity and key statistics during the specified time period.

**Manuscript Country/Region of Origin Summary Report:** This report provides a summary of all submitted manuscripts between the chosen start and end dates (based on initial date submitted) grouped by final disposition (including incomplete) and sorted by the corresponding author’s country or manuscript region of origin. This includes percent reject/accept, average days to review and average days from receipt to final disposition.

**Manuscript Country/Region of Origin Detail Report:** This report provides a summary of all submitted manuscripts between the chosen start and end dates (based on initial date submitted) grouped by final disposition (including incomplete) and sorted by the corresponding author’s country or manuscript region of origin. This includes percent reject/accept, average days to review and average days from receipt to final disposition.

**Reviewer Country of Origin Report:** This report provides a summary of all reviews assigned between the chosen start and end dates (based on role start date) grouped by final disposition.
(including incomplete) and sorted by the country of origin of the reviewer. This includes percent reject/accept, average days to review and average review rating.

ISO Standard Country Comparison Report: This report compares the address record for all users to the ISO 3166-1 Newsletter V-8 standard list of countries. Any mismatches appear on the report. To create a tab-delimited data file of the report results, check the box below. Click the submit button to run the report.
4.5 Editorial Manager Frequently Asked Questions

What do I need to do to use the online peer review manuscript tracking system, Editorial Manager™?

How do I update my contact information in Editorial Manager?

How do I change my password?

What if I forget my password?

What kind of user should I log-in as: Author, Reviewer, Editor, or Publisher?

Who is the “corresponding author” and what are his/her responsibilities?

How can I submit a paper to the AAPS ejournals?

What happens to my manuscript after I submit it?

What happens if my manuscript is not accepted for review?

Once I submit a manuscript, how can I check the status of my submission?

May I suggest reviewers for my manuscript?

Can Editorial Manager contact me at multiple email addresses?

How can I notify Editorial Manager if I am unavailable for a prolonged period of time?

Is the order in which the authors are listed of any significance?

Is it necessary to select classifications for my manuscript?

Are certain fonts better than others?

Some components of my manuscript are not in electronic format; what should I do with these?

How do I submit the legends for my figures?

If my Internet connection goes down while I’m inputting or updating a record, is the information saved?

If I leave Editorial Manager to search the Web, do I need to log back in?

What does it mean when a submission is incomplete?

If an author is asked to revise a manuscript, how does he/she submit the revisions?

I’m trying to attach a file to my manuscript submission but it isn’t attaching. What can I do to make it work?

What file formats does Editorial Manager accept?

Can I do a partial submission and come back later to finish it?

If I make a mistake while submitting my manuscript, should I abandon it and start it over as a new submission?

How can I contact the AAPS Editorial Office?
Will I receive proofs of my accepted article?
Do the AAPS journals use DOI designation for citations?
Do the AAPS journals and Springer support publishing in PubMed Central for NIH Grantees?
How can I obtain permission to use copyrighted material from the journal?
How can I order reprints?
What do I need to do to use the online peer-review manuscript tracking system, Editorial Manager?
If you have not registered with Editorial Manager for The AAPS Journal or AAPS PharmSciTech, you will need to do so before submitting a manuscript. Simply go to www.editorialmanager.com/aapsj (for The AAPS Journal) or www.editorialmanager.com/aapspt (for AAPS PharmSciTech) and click on “Register” under the journal title. The AAPS Journal and AAPS PharmSciTech share a common user database; registration in both journals is unnecessary.

How do I update my contact information in Editorial Manager?
You must make changes to your existing profile information by clicking the “Update My Information” link on the main navigation menu after signing into Editorial Manager. Keeping your email and other contact information up-to-date is necessary to receive relevant information about assignments. You may sign-in at either www.editorialmanager.com/aapsj or www.editorialmanager.com/aapspt.

How do I change my password?
Although Editorial Manager automatically assigns a password to your account, you may change yours at any time using the following instructions:

Use your assigned username and password to sign into Editorial Manager. Select “Update My Information” on the main navigation menu. This will place you in the user registration form that you completed to originally register.

In the field next to “Password,” you may overwrite your current password with a new password. Click the “Submit” button at the bottom of the form. The next time you sign into Editorial Manager, you must use your new password.

What if I forget my password?
Editorial Manager can send you an informational email if you forget your password. Please follow the instructions below.

Click “Login” on the main navigation menu in Editorial Manager. Select “Forget Your Password?” Enter your username and email address. Click “Send Password.” You will then receive an email containing your password.

What kind of user should I log in as: Author, Reviewer, Editor, or Publisher?
You may sign into Editorial Manager as soon as you are successfully registered. Authors must choose “Author Login,” reviewers must choose “Reviewer Login,” and so forth. All editors are registered in the system as authors and reviewers, and all authors are registered as reviewers.

Select “Login” on the main navigation menu. Enter your username and password. Next click the button that corresponds to your role within Editorial Manager. If you hit the enter key on your keyboard, you will automatically be logged in as an author. Once you sign in properly, a menu of actions specific to your role within the system will be presented.
Who is the “corresponding author” and what are his/her responsibilities?
The corresponding author is the person who is responsible for the manuscript as it moves through the journal’s submission process. This person must be registered with Editorial Manager, as all correspondence pertaining to the manuscript will be sent to him/her via the system. The corresponding author is, by default, the author who initially uploads the manuscript into Editorial Manager. If anyone else uploads the manuscript on behalf of the corresponding author, he/she must sign in with the corresponding author’s username and password.

The corresponding author is also the person responsible for making edits and submitting revisions to the manuscript. The corresponding author is the only author able to view the manuscript’s progress through Editorial Manager, and he/she is responsible for relaying details about this process to the other manuscript authors. The corresponding author is responsible for incorporating changes and representing all authors in the process.

How can I submit a paper to the AAPS ejournals?
Once you have completed your manuscript and ensured it adheres to our Author Instructions, you may submit to www.editorialmanager.com/aapspt. Access to the author instructions is located on the sign-in page for each journal. If you have not registered with Editorial Manager for The AAPS Journal or AAPS PharmSciTech, you will need to register before submitting a manuscript. See also, “What do I need to do to use the new online peer-review manuscript tracking system, Editorial Manager?” item #1 for registration instructions.

What happens to my manuscript after I submit it?
After the corresponding author submits a manuscript, it is assigned to an editor. The editor will evaluate the manuscript on its scientific originality and support of the content and will make a decision as to whether a manuscript will be placed into peer review.

If the manuscript is placed into peer review, the editor will invite reviewers to comment on your manuscript. Once all reviews have been completed, you will receive reviewer and editor queries and comments and you may be requested to respond to and revise your manuscript according to these queries. You will be notified whether your manuscript requires minor or major revisions.

You must always work with and make edits to your initial submission. Brand new submissions uploaded in response to revision requests will not be accepted and the AAPS Editorial Office may remove these from Editorial Manager. When you have revised your manuscript and addressed the reviewers’ and editors’ concerns, you may submit your revision. The editor will then review the revised submission and determine if further review and/or revision is necessary or if your manuscript is acceptable for publication.

When your manuscript is accepted for publication, it will enter the production process. See also “Will I receive proofs of my accepted article?” item #28 for further information on the galley proof and production process.

What happens if my manuscript is not accepted for publication?
If your manuscript is rejected, you will receive editor and reviewer comments. The editor may also provide information if further action applies.
Once I submit a manuscript, how can I check the status of my submission?
A corresponding author may view the status of any manuscript that he/she has submitted to a particular journal in Editorial Manager. The corresponding author can simply sign into Editorial Manager using his/her username and password to view the status of a manuscript. The corresponding author will also be notified by email any time the status of a manuscript changes.

May I suggest reviewers for my manuscript?
At the time of submission, the corresponding author may request up to four reviewers who are qualified in the subject of the submitted manuscript. Authors may also request the exclusion of up to four reviewers. These requests may be made during the submission process and may also be included in the cover letter submitted with the manuscript. Please include the suggested/excluded reviewer’s title, full name, and affiliations as well as his/her email address. Please also include a telephone number for suggested reviewers. Your suggestions for reviewers will only be visible to the editor and will not be visible to the invited reviewers.

Can Editorial Manager contact me at multiple email addresses?
Yes, Editorial Manager can contact you at multiple email addresses, if you provide them in your profile. When initially registering online with Editorial Manager, type the multiple email addresses in the Personal Information section using a semi-colon between each address (e.g., joe@thejournal.com; joe@yahoo.com). If you have already registered, you can add email addresses by selecting “Update My Information” on the main navigation menu.

How can I notify Editorial Manager if I am unavailable for a prolonged period of time?
Select “Update My Information” on the main navigation menu and then click on the “Alternate Contact Information” button in the Personal Information section. Not only can you enter information for an alternate contact, but you can also specify the time period for the alternate contact.

Is the order in which the authors are listed of any significance?
The AMA Manual of Style, 9th ed., makes the following assertions: Only those individuals who meet the criteria for authorship may be listed as authors. The first author has contributed the most to the manuscript, and the last author has contributed the least.

Decisions about the order of authors must be made before a manuscript is submitted and must be resolved by the authors (not the editor).

Is it necessary to select classifications for my manuscript?
You are required to select classifications for your manuscript to enable the editor to invite reviewers who have identical or similar classifications to your submission.

You will also be required to select personal classifications for yourself upon registering with Editorial Manager, or when you update your account information. Entering this information allows our editors to search for appropriately qualified reviewers for new submissions.
Are certain fonts better than others?
Although it is not required, Arial font (10 point) is preferred. It is essential, however, that you use symbol fonts for special characters, including mathematical signs and symbols, as well as Greek letters.

Some components of my manuscript are not in electronic format; what should I do with these?
Since AAPS PharmSciTech uses Editorial Manager, all manuscript components must be in electronic format, including figures. Please review the Author Instructions for additional details on figure file formats.

How do I submit the legends for my figures?
All legends must begin with a short descriptive sentence that sums up the intent and content of the data contained in the figure. The caption should be concise and consist of approximately 30 words. All captions for figures/artwork should be separated from the manuscript text and collated in a separate section called “Figure Legends;” this legend should be on a separate page at the end of the manuscript following the references list or may be included in the manuscript inventory as a separate Microsoft Word document.

If my Internet connection goes down while I’m inputting or updating a record, is the information saved?
It depends on the process on which you were working. Most data is saved in Editorial Manager instantaneously. If you are completing a form, such as a reviewer form in Editorial Manager, the data will be saved when you save or submit that form. It is wise to check that the record in Editorial Manager was updated when your connection was lost.

If I leave Editorial Manager to search the Web, do I need to log back in?
If you leave Editorial Manager without clicking “Log out” on the top of the page, you remain logged in as a user. You are able access other websites and then return to Editorial Manager. We do suggest that you open another browser window tab if you are frequently toggling between Editorial Manager and other websites; clicking the back and forward buttons may disrupt your Internet connection to Editorial Manager.

Editorial Manager will time-out after an extended period of nonuse, and you will be prompted to sign back in. Since Editorial Manager is accessible from any computer with Web access, the timing-out of your session is a security measure.

What does it mean when a submission is incomplete?
If the corresponding author neglects to click the “Approve Submission” link after creating and reviewing the PDF of his/her manuscript, the submission will be classified as “Incomplete.” Incomplete submissions ARE NOT transmitted to the AAPS Editorial Office and, instead, will be moved to the author’s “Incomplete Submissions” folder under the author main menu.

If an author is asked to revise a manuscript, how does he/she submit the revisions?
Select “Main Menu.” Please review the collection of links that are organized by category, found
under "Revisions," which allow you to perform actions on your revised submission. Editorial Manager will guide you through the steps required to revise your manuscript.

The “Submissions Needing Revision” folder contains manuscripts with a “Revise” editorial decision, waiting for author action to revise.

The “Incomplete Revisions” folder contains revisions that are works-in-progress. Any revised manuscripts that are not yet complete and for which you have not built a PDF are also found in this folder.

The “Revisions Waiting for Author's Approval” folder contains all revised manuscripts for which you have built the PDF but have not yet viewed the submission and the art quality checker and approved the file for submission to Editorial Manager. This folder contains information such as the title, date submitted, status date, and current status of your manuscript.

The "Revisions Being Processed" folder contains revised manuscripts that are in the reviewed and/or edited process. You may check on the status of your manuscript as well as view the PDF of your submission by clicking “View Revision” in the “Actions” column.

The “Declined Revisions” folder stores all manuscripts that you declined to revise. If you declined in error, you are able to reinstate your revision here.

**I’m trying to attach a file to my manuscript submission but it isn’t attaching. What can I do to make it work?**

It is possible that your computer has insufficient memory available due to multiple applications being open. Close all applications and/or reboot your computer. Try to attach the file again running only the necessary browser application (Netscape, Internet Explorer, Mozilla, etc.) to access Editorial Manager.

**What file formats does Editorial Manager accept?**

The manuscript text may be submitted in PDF format for the initial submission only. All subsequent revision submissions must be in Microsoft Word. Editorial Manager also accepts figure files in the following formats: PDF, EPS, TIFF, BMP, JPG, or PNG. If you are using the EPS file format, you must save with “fonts included” and use the TIFF preview. Please refer to the figures section in the [author instructions](#) for additional details regarding figure file quality and formatting.

**Can I do a partial submission and come back later to finish it?**

Yes. Once you have provided a title for your submission, you can exit the system and continue the process at another time, without saving the file. You will find an unfinished submission in your “Incomplete Submissions” folder on your main menu. The AAPS Editorial Office will not receive your manuscript until you complete and officially “review and approve” your submission.

**If I make a mistake while submitting my manuscript, should I abandon it and start it over as a new submission?**

No. You will always be able to delete any part of your submission that you may have entered
incorrectly (e.g., a file that you may have uploaded by mistake). You must click “Remove” to delete files you do not want attached to your manuscript.

**How can I contact the AAPS Editorial Office?**
You may contact the journal’s editorial office by clicking “Contact Us” in the toolbar at the top of your Editorial Manager screen and composing an email, or you can email the office anytime at AAPSPT@aaps.org.

**Will I receive proofs of my accepted article?**
Yes. You will receive an email from Springer Customer Support when your galley proof is available online. Please review the proof and respond to all queries. You will be instructed how to approve the proof and/or submit corrections.

This proof process will be the only opportunity you will have to view and correct the manuscript prior to publication. As corresponding author you are responsible for answering all copyediting and proofing queries and relaying details about this process to all manuscript authors. When your corrections to the proof are incorporated, your article will be published online.

**Do the AAPS journals use DOI designation for citations?**
Yes. Assigning a DOI to each cited reference ensures that a persistent link to the work is included for readers. A DOI, as stated on the CrossRef website (www.crossref.org), is “A unique alphanumeric string assigned to a digital object—in this case, an electronic journal article or a book chapter. In the CrossRef system, each DOI is associated with a set of basic metadata and a URL pointer to the full text, so that it uniquely identifies the content item and provides a persistent link to its location on the internet.”

**Do the AAPS journals and Springer support publishing in PubMed Central for NIH Grantees?**
If you choose to publish your article as open access within the Springer Open Choice program, Springer deposits the final published version of your article into PubMed Central, and it is made immediately publicly accessible. The copyright will remain with you, and the article will be published under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial License. The cost of Springer Open Choice (USD 3,000/ EUR 2,000) is—as stated on the NIH Web site—a permissible cost in your grant.

If you choose to publish your article with the traditional subscription-based model (without open access), you may notify Springer to deposit the author’s accepted version of your article into PubMed Central where it will be made publicly available 12 months after publication. Within Springer’s MyPublication process, we will inform you on how to notify us. Please note that we require your full NIH grant number and can only process requests with a full and properly formed grant number. An example would be: “R01 GM012345-03.” For further information on this process please visit http://www.springer.com/gp/open-access/springer-open-choice.

**How can I obtain permission to use copyrighted material from the journal?**
Permission can be obtained for AAPS journal articles via Springer, our publisher. When viewing an
article on the Springer site, choose “Reprints and Permissions” on the right-side of the page. Learn more here.

For all other permission inquiries, please email permissions@aaps.org.
5.1 The AAPS eJournals Instructions for Authors

Find the AAPS PharmSciTech Instructions for Authors here.

Find The AAPS Journal Instructions for Authors here.
5.2 Professional Language Editing Services

AAPS has partnered with American Journal Experts (AJE) to provide an optional professional language editing service to authors submitting manuscripts to The AAPS Journal or AAPS PharmSciTech. AJE employs expert editors with post-graduate training in a wide variety of fields who will check authors’ manuscripts not only for terminology and language specific to the pharmaceutical sciences but also for proper English usage, grammar, punctuation, spelling, verb tense, phrasing, and sentence construction. Visit AJE’s website for more information including associated fees or to submit a document for their English editing service.

For questions about AJE services please contact AJE at:

American Journal Experts, LLC
3710 University Drive, Suite 308
Durham, NC 27707
Email: support@journalexperts.com
Web: www.journalexperts.com

To ensure accurate use of style please identify AAPS as the referring party when submitting a manuscript for The AAPS Journal or AAPS PharmSciTech to AJE for language editing services.

Disclaimer: Information about AJE and their services is strictly an informational option provided to AAPS authors. Use of AJE editing services does not imply, enhance, or ensure acceptance of a manuscript for publication in an AAPS journal. AAPS or its journals are not responsible for any fees that AJE charges. Authors may also choose to use other editing services without prejudice from the editorial offices.
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