

Instructions for Reviewers

Review Process

The JOCIH relies on an open and transparent review process. Submitted manuscripts are posted on the journal's website and are publicly available. The standard workflow of the review process is as follows.

1. Authors submit their article using the journal website.
2. The article is made available on the journal website. A member of the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) is assigned to the article.
3. The SAB solicits three reviews, usually to be completed within 6 weeks.
4. The reviews of the solicited public reviewers are posted on the journal website. However, reviewers may choose to remain anonymous.
5. The SAB, together with the journal editors, decide on acceptance or rejection of the article.
6. If the article gets accepted, all reviewers and editors which were substantially involved are named in the final version.
7. The authors are encouraged to upload the final drafts of accepted versions on their local websites.
8. Please note that authors and reviewers will not directly discuss papers under review or under revision without approval by the editors-in-chief.

Decisions on submitted manuscripts are one of the following.

1. Accept
2. Minor revisions required
3. Major revisions required
4. Resubmit

They mean the following:

1. The manuscript is suitable for publication and only requires minor polishing.
2. The authors are required to make moderate changes to their manuscript. The revised manuscript will be sent back to the reviewers for a second round of reviews. Authors are requested to provide a letter to the reviewers detailing the improvements made for the resubmission.
3. The manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in its current form. However, a major revision which addresses all issues raised by the reviewers may be acceptable

for publication. Authors are requested to provide a letter to the reviewers detailing the improvements made for the resubmission.

4. In its current form, the manuscript is not suitable for publication. This is a rejection. However, the author is encouraged to resubmit a full new version of the paper.

In addition to the decision categories, reviewers are asked to provide a detailed review focusing on: (i) quality (ii) writing, (iii) clarity, (iv) structure, (v) suitability, (vi) state of the art (references), and (vii) innovation of the manuscript. Some comments may be addressed solely to the editors as well.