

Reviewer Guidelines for CEAS Aeronautical Journal

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for the CEAS Aeronautical Journal. The journal is devoted to publishing new developments and results in all areas of aeronautics-related science and technology. Also of interest are (invited) in-depth reviews of the status of development in specific areas of relevance to aeronautics and descriptions of the potential way forward. The topics of the journal are aeroacoustics, aeroelasticity, air transport system, air traffic management, flight mechanics, flight physics and aerodynamics, propulsion, structures and materials. Reports on new developments in design and manufacturing of aircraft, rotorcraft, missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles are also welcome.

These instructions are provided to assist you in the review process. You have been invited to serve as a reviewer because of your expertise in the research topic of the submitted article. The editors rely on your expert assessment to ensure that the journal publishes high quality research of significant scientific interest. Your review also assists the authors in improving the presentation of their research. You may make recommendations regarding revision or additional data that must be included before the article is acceptable for publication. Finally, you are responsible for alerting the editors to any ethical concerns or potential inadequacies in the disclosure of authors' competing interests.

General Guidelines

Confidentiality

- In order to maintain the integrity of the review process, please do not discuss the manuscript you are reviewing with anyone outside the Editorial Office without specific permission from the editor.
- You are welcome to solicit input from one or two colleagues in performing the review; this should only be done with explicit permission from the editor. In addition, colleagues' (with names) involvement should be mentioned in the Confidential Comments to Editor, once the review is submitted and complete.
- Please do not copy, disseminate, or share information in the manuscript for any purpose, including classroom use, or use it for advancement of your own research.
- Please do not divulge to the authors that you are reviewing the manuscript, even if you need clarifications; those questions should be included in the comments for the authors in the review and will be handled by the Editorial Office.
- When you have completed and submitted your review, please delete or destroy all copies of downloaded or printed manuscript files, as these are the property of the submitting authors.

Deadlines

The CEAS Aeronautical Journal is committed to rapid manuscript processing and publication. We request that reviewers complete their reviews by the deadline indicated at invitation. If any difficulties arise that may prevent you from submitting the review on time, please contact the editor immediately.

Reviewer Competing Interests

We ask that you reveal any potential competing interest – financial or personal – that may bias your review of the submitted manuscript, including

- any financial interest in the publication or non-publication of the paper;
- current or planned close collaboration with the author(s);
- dependent employment or supervisory relationship (e.g. teacher – student relationship)

Reviewer Guidelines for CEAS Aeronautical Journal

up to and including the postdoctoral phase) extending six years beyond the conclusion of the relationship;

- the affiliation or pending transfer to the same department or to the same research institute;
- scientific cooperation within the last three years, e.g. joint publications;
- a history of dispute with the authors.

You are not precluded from reviewing the manuscript because you have previously reviewed a version for another journal. However, in the Confidential Comments to the Editor, please note this and let us know whether the authors have improved the manuscript in response to your review elsewhere.

Author Competing Interests

Please consider any issues of bias that arise based on the content of the paper and the authors' affiliations. Share your concerns with the editors in the Confidential Comments to Editor.

Specific Instructions for Original Research Articles

The CEAS Aeronautical Journal strives to publish original articles that would typically fall in the top 10% quality rating of all published papers in the field. Please organise your review into Comments for Authors and Confidential Comments to the Editor.

Comments to Authors

Comments to the authors should include an introductory section discussing:

- Suitability of the manuscript for the CEAS Aeronautical Journal;
- The significance and interest of the paper to the CEAS Aeronautical Journal readers;
- Importance of the study to the field, advancement of knowledge;
- The originality, novelty and soundness of the methods and analysis;
- Whether the conclusions drawn are justified by the data that is presented;
- Major positive and negative aspects of the manuscript, including major deficiencies or irreparable flaws;
- Clarity of presentation and appropriate use of language (English)

As you review the manuscript, keep in mind that the most helpful reviews briefly state the reasons for your assessments. Such detailed comments will help the editors make a decision.

Following the introductory section of your review, please provide specific concerns in a numbered (1, 2, 3, etc.) list with specific page/line numbers where indicated. Numbered comments will facilitate the editors' communication with the authors, the authors' responses, and will serve to guide re-review of the revised manuscript.

As you read the manuscript, consider the following issues and make comments in your review if warranted:

- General presentation: Is the writing concise, clear, and well organised? Do all sections of the manuscript consistently reflect the major point being made? Should the paper or parts of it be shortened or expanded? Are findings new, unique, convincing, interesting?
- Abstract: Does it accurately reflect and summarise the paper?
- Introduction: Is the research question or hypothesis clearly stated?
- Methods and statistical design: Are the methods valid for the question asked? Are they

Reviewer Guidelines for CEAS Aeronautical Journal

current? Are they clearly presented so that the work can be replicated by other researchers?

- Results and data: Are they clearly summarised? Are data in the text and tables/figures consistent? Are tables/figures included necessary? Is information needlessly repeated?
- Discussion: Are the conclusions justified and interpretations sound? Are the limitations of the study noted?
- Citations: Are the cited references pertinent and current? Do they support any assertions of fact not addressed by the data presented in this paper?
- Figures: Are figures of high quality and clearly labeled? Are legends and titles clear?

Do not make specific statements regarding acceptance or rejection in your comments to the authors. Do not edit the paper for grammar, spelling, etc., although you may comment that these need improvement. Comments should be courteous, constructive and should relate to the manuscript and not to the authors.

Confidential Comments to the Editor

This section should not duplicate or rehash Comments to Authors. It is used to provide advice regarding acceptance, revision or rejection. Also, it will be helpful to the editors if you provide an assessment of whether the article meets the top 10% quality standard. If you have any concerns regarding a breach of publication or scientific ethics, or the failure to adequately disclose competing interests, please discuss in this section. This section should also be used to alert the editors to an article that may be controversial and require special consideration before publication.

What happens with your review?

The CEAS Aeronautical Journal uses the Editorial Manager® system <http://canj.edmgr.com/> for electronic submission and anonymous peer review of manuscripts. Reviewers are registered by the editor and receive an e-mail containing their user name and password to access the site. The editor avoids bothering reviewers with manuscripts being obviously inappropriate or seriously flawed.

- a) Two reviews are required in the system in order to make a decision with respect to the acceptance or not of the paper.
- b) Based on the reviews the editor makes a decision.
- c) The decision is communicated to the author(s) and if the reviewers request it a revision is asked responding to the comments of the reviewers.
- d) The communicating author submits the revised version of the paper, responding to each of the comments of both reviewers.
- e) The revised version is sent to the reviewers to check whether their comments were taken care of in the revised paper, and either they accept or reject the paper, or else another revision will be asked for.
- f) Finally, the paper is either accepted or rejected. At this point in time the reviewers will be informed about the result of their work.
- g) Assume the paper is accepted. Then the revised version is transferred to Springer's production unit, and a few weeks later the paper will appear "online-first" in electronic form on Springer's server.
- h) As soon as a sufficiently large number of papers is accepted, a paper version will be issued including page numbers.



Reviewer Guidelines for CEAS Aeronautical Journal



<http://www.springer.com/journal/13272>

An Official Journal of the Council of European Aerospace Societies

Editor-in-Chief: Rolf Henke, Cologne

Managing Editor: C. Hillenherms, Cologne

Editorial Board

P. Bearman, RAeS, London

C. Hermans, NVvL, Amsterdam

T. Tsitinidis, HAES, Athens

P. Gaudenzi, AIDAA, Rome

J. Steelant, ESA/ESTEC, Noordwijk

H. Voggenreiter, DLR, Stuttgart

ISSN: 1869-5582 (print version)

ISSN: 1869-5590 (electronic version)

Journal no. 13272



<http://www.springer.com/journal/13272>

CEAS Aeronautical Journal

An Official Journal of the Council of European Aerospace
Societies

Editor-in-Chief: Henke, R.

ISSN: 1869-5582 (print version)

ISSN: 1869-5590 (electronic version)

Journal no. 13272