

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The peer review process represents a vital element of maintaining high standards in scholarly publishing. This process could not be managed without knowledge and experience of contributing specialists. We appreciate the time and effort all our reviewers spend evaluating manuscripts for *Gravitational and Space Research*.

General Expectations

While preparing the reports, we ask our Referees to:

- comment on originality of the presented work
- evaluate the authors' approach to the discussed problem
- evaluate the reliability of the obtained results and correctness of drawn conclusions
- comment on technical aspects of paper, give the final evaluation of paper
- inform us whether we should consider it further and what should be done in order to make it publishable (if it is possible); and
- give us an idea of possible impact that the paper might have on the GSR research community

Gravitational and Space Research uses a closed, single-blind peer review system (the names of the reviewers are hidden from the authors). Submitted manuscripts are reviewed by two or more experts. Reviewers are asked to recommend whether a manuscript should be accepted, revised or rejected. All Sciendo journals use the plagiarism screening tool CrossCheck/iThenticate, but we are most grateful to reviewers who kindly alert the editors if they suspect any issues relating to such authors' misconduct such as plagiarism if they are willing.

Reviewers are asked to provide detailed, constructive comments that will help both the editors make a decision on the publication and the author(s) to improve their manuscript. They should point out whether the work has serious flaws that preclude its publication, or whether additional experiments should be carried out or additional data should be collected to support the conclusions drawn.

Reviewers invited by the editors should reveal any potential conflict of interest they may have with respect to the manuscript or the authors. All likely personal, professional or financial conflicts of interest should be considered.

Specific Expectations

Originality and significance of the presented work

Reviewers are asked to comment on the originality and significance of the work for the scientific community. The major findings or results are should not be published elsewhere in any medium neither by the authors nor somebody else and is not currently under consideration for publication in any other medium. This restriction does not apply to review articles. If the presented research is unoriginal and similar work has been published previously, reviewers should give references.

Focus on the core aims and scope of the journal

Gravitational and Space Research is the journal of the American Society for Gravitational and Space Research that is devoted to research in furthering the understanding of the effects of gravity and the use of the unique environment of spaceflight for research. Subject matter can include any topic within the following broad categories: the impact of gravity and changes in the gravity vector on biology, astrobiology, spaceflight and planetary analog environment research, advanced life support, biophysics, radiation biology, human-tended spaceflight, satellite payloads, suborbital research, parabolic flight, sounding rockets, high altitude balloons, hardware engineering and development, acceleration in altered gravity environments, combustion science, complex fluids, fluid physics, fundamental physics, and materials science. In addition, research wholly dedicated to terrestrial explorations of the impact of gravity and to changes in the gravity vector is welcome. The categories of papers include Short Communication; Methods; Research; Hypothesis; and Review. We are also open to publishing Educational Outreach papers associated with gravitational and space sciences.

Experimental or theoretical approach to the discussed problem

As experts in the relevant field, reviewers are asked to discuss the novelty of theoretical approaches and experimental methods presented in the manuscript.

Strengths and weaknesses of the methods used

Reviewers should assess the appropriateness of the methods used. If necessary, technical aspects of the paper, such as the statistical analyses, should be commented. They should suggest improvements that will result in the enhancement of the quality of the paper.

Reliability of the results and validity of the conclusions

Reviewers are requested to comment on the reliability of new methods developed. They should consider whether the conclusion(s) drawn are supported by the data collected.

Organization of the manuscript

Reviewers should comment whether the manuscript is easy to read and the arguments are described in a logical and understandable way. They should suggest improvements, if necessary.

Articles submitted to *Gravitational and Space Research* must be clearly and correctly written, contain all essential features of a complete scientific paper and be readable for a wide audience of individuals associated with the fields of physical and life space sciences.

Discussion of the most relevant literature on the topic

Reviewers should comment on the relevance of literature cited in the manuscript. They should give reference to any important research not mentioned in the paper or in the book proposal.

Revisions

When revision of the manuscript is suggested, reviewers are asked to recommend which aspects of the work should be improved: better motivation for the research, additional data to confirm conclusions, better organization of the paper or the manuscript.

Please note that, if necessary, accepted manuscripts will undergo language editing by native English speakers. Incorrect grammar, style or punctuation should not constitute a sufficient reason to reject a paper if it is still intelligible for the reviewer and its content warrants publication from a scientific point of view.

Publication Formats

Research Paper

A Short Communications, Methods, Research, Hypothesis, or Educational paper should report original results in all aforementioned areas of space sciences that are included in the journal scope. It should be organized using the following sections: Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Acknowledgments, Conflict of interest statement, References, Figure Legends and Table Captions, Tables, Figures, and Supplemental data (if applicable).

Review Paper

Review paper should contain the most significant results of the subject under review. It should describe the most relevant and recent contributions, the subject matter should be discussed competently and the choice of citations should be adequate.

Confidentiality

The contents and the very existence of a submitted manuscript must be considered as confidential until the article is published. If the article is not accepted for the journal, then all aspects of its review in this journal are to be considered as confidential without time limit. Suggestions for alternative reviewers are helpful to the editors and would be appreciated. Reviewers are requested to adhere to this important principle.

Anonymity of Reviewers

Authors will not know the identity of the reviewers unless the reviewer themselves chooses to divulge their identity. Reviewers know the identity of the authors. Reviewers normally see the other reviews of the same article after they have returned their own review, but will normally not know the identity of the other reviewers. Exceptions to the last rule are sometimes made in case of strongly conflicting reviews, where the reviewers may be invited to interact in order to find out whether this leads one of them to adopt the other one's position on the paper. Reviewers are of course free to divulge their identity to the authors if they should desire so.

Reviews that are returned as PDF or Word documents may be labeled with the identity of the author of that document in their data field. It is the responsibility of the reviewer to

remove such information from the review document before it is returned to the editors if they wish to retain her anonymity vis-a-vis the author.

Frequently Asked Questions

How long time do I have for completing the review?

Typically we request the review between two and four weeks from the date of receipt of the article, unless otherwise agreed.

Is there a reviewing form to be filled in?

A form is available. Please see below under Reviewing Instructions. The reviewing form will automatically be sent to all reviewers. Notice, however, that the use of the form is not obligatory, and free-text reviews are also welcome.

If the paper is really weak, do you want me to make a full review anyway?

An explanation of what the author(s) have to do in order to do better next time is, of course, a service to them. However, if the answer is going to be no then it's also in the authors' interest to get to know that quickly.

Where shall I send the review?

All reviews should be uploaded within the Scholar One submission system.