

Overview of the review process

The peer review process starts once you have submitted your paper to the conference. After submission, your paper will be sent for assessment by independent experts in your field. The reviewers are asked to judge the validity, significance, and originality of your work.

Peer review is an integral part of scientific publishing that confirms the validity of the manuscript. Peer reviewers are experts who volunteer their time to help improve the manuscripts they review.

The review is single blind, meaning that the reviewers know the names of the authors, but the authors do not know who reviewed their manuscript unless the reviewer chooses to sign their report.

Grounds for immediate dismissal of a review/viewpoint are:

1. Improper use of the English language (grammar, syntax, vocabulary).
2. The subject matter is not within the focus of the proceedings.
3. The manuscript does not present a balanced approach of the subject matter.
4. The manuscript does not have the required word length or the required number of references, if that is the case.
5. The manuscript is not creative or stimulating enough for the readership of the ICESS.

The other types of manuscripts (conceptual papers, research articles and literature reviews) go through the **single-blind peer-review process** described below.

The article is **uploaded on the platform of the Proceedings**. Each submission is acknowledged by one of the members of the editorial team and then the **pre-selection** begins. At this stage, the members of the editorial team choose to either reject the article directly or to send it to the reviewers for a thorough review. The **grounds for immediate dismissal** (desk rejection) of a manuscript are the following:

0. Plagiarism
1. The standard of English is not considered to be good enough for publication in ICESS. If English is not the first language of the authors, they should make sure the paper is proofread by a professional or a native speaker.
2. The length of the article is not inside the interval provided above. We accept articles that have a lower or higher word count if they bring an actual contribution to the field (same rule applies to number of authors).
3. The abstract is not written in accordance with the rules explicitly stated on the proceedings' website
4. The data presented in the article are outdated (either the bibliography is not up-to-date or the research materials are too old).
5. There are not enough references, or the references are too local, too old or too focused on a certain perspective and do not present a balanced, current view of the state of research.

Also, if there are clear suspicions of fraud, the article will be rejected without the possibility of being resubmitted. By fraud we understand that portions or the whole text has been published elsewhere, that there are instances of plagiarism or that the data is suspected to have been faked.

Each author receives notice of the final decision made by the editorial team which can be of two kinds: a) decision to include the article in the review process or b) decision to reject the article followed by the list of reasons that have led to that decision. Authors whose articles have been rejected for reasons other than fraud can choose to resubmit their work for a second and third time. If after the third try the article is still not considered a good fit for the ICESS, then the author is prohibited from resubmitting the work again.

If the article passes this pre-selection then it is sent for **peer-review** to two or three professionals with experience in the field. This stage lasts between four to six weeks depending on the complexity of the article and the availability of experts in the field. The final decision of the peer-review process can be of four kinds:

- **Rejected** - This decision signals that there are major concerns over the quality of the scientific materials presented in the paper and that the reviewers consider there is no chance in improving the article in such a way as to become a suitable candidate for publication in ICESS. Examples of problems that can lead to this type of decision: serious methodological issues, lack of clear contributions to the advancement of the field, lack of ability to interpret the research results in a scientifically fruitful way etc. This decision is accompanied by a list of reasons which have led to the rejection of the article submitted by each reviewer.
- **Accepted with major changes** - Most of the articles submitted to ICESS fall in this category. These are articles which show promise, but they need further elaborate work. Thus, each reviewer sends his or her recommendations and the authors are encouraged to rewrite their articles.
- **Accepted with no changes and Accepted with minor changes** - This decisions signal that the article in its present form, with minor modifications is suitable for publication. The authors received the decision followed by the suggestions of the peer reviewers and their submission, after alterations, will step on to the next stage.

Formatting - Before publication, all articles undergo a formatting stage in which their format is made compatible to the requirements of the ICESS. All authors are asked to comply with the requirements before submitting their articles, but all accepted articles still require minor alterations in format and style. Once the editorial team agrees on the final version, a final copy of the article will be sent to the authors for approval and then will be sent to print.

Publication - After formatting, all articles set to be included in the following issue will appear online according to the publication schedule.