Guidelines for Processing Submissions

Each submitted paper is tentatively assigned by the Editor-in-Chief to an Editorial Board Member. If (s)he agrees to take it on, they become the communicating editor and must then rapidly decide on the paper’s basic suitability for the journal. Unsuitable papers (over-narrowly technical; of obviously minor import ... ) may be rejected immediately, without further review, perhaps recommending that publication elsewhere be sought. The Senior Editors, Managing Editor and Editor-in-Chief will help make such determinations if needed, but hope to rely largely on the recommendations of the individual board members.

If the paper passes this first test, the communicating editor must then suggest three or four names of potential reviewers, supplying email addresses if possible, and ranking them in order of choice. The communicating editor may decide to provide one of the reviews him- or herself, and (s)he is in any case expected to read the paper and comment briefly on it in his or her summary of the reviews that are eventually obtained. The journal normally seeks two reviews: ideally, one from an expert in the area of application, and one from an expert in the mathematical methods employed in the paper, or, in the case of experimental papers, in the experimental techniques. (The list of three or four names is to guard against declinations.) Unusually large or wide-ranging papers may require three or more reviews. The Editorial Office will send out the papers with reviewer guidelines and will chase late reviews. As reviews come in, they will be sent to the assigned editor, who will make a recommendation of acceptance as is (very rare), acceptance subject to required and/or recommended revisions, or rejection. This recommendation should take the form of a brief report on the paper summarizing and, if necessary, interpreting comments from the detailed reviews, and explaining why the paper deserves publication in JNLS. This latter statement should be suitable for excerpting and publishing on the Journal’s web page in order to notify readers of upcoming papers. Subject to the Editor-in-Chief’s approval, the Editorial Office will then draft a letter to the author(s) conveying this message. In the event of split opinions that the communicating editor is unable or unwilling to adjudicate, the Editor-in-Chief will ask appropriate Senior Editors to help ‘break the tie.’

Normally the Editor’s name will be made known to the author(s) of papers with which (s)he is dealing (reviewers will remain anonymous, unless they request that their identities be revealed). If an Editor provides a review (s)he may wish to conceal his(her) identity. In any case the Editor should clearly inform the Editorial office of his(her) wishes.

Papers will appear, as in the past, with the note ‘Communicated by [communicating editor’s name].’