

## Policy for special issue editors-in-chief and lead editors

### Manuscript review by technical editors for IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON APPLIED SUPERCONDUCTIVITY

Date: 12 October 2015

Drafted by: Lance Cooley, Fermilab

Reviewed by: Britton Plourde, TAS Editor in Chief

Reviewed by: Alan Kleinsasser, IEEE Council on Superconductivity, Vice-President – Publications

Editors for TAS special issues provide a significant service to the superconductivity community. Often, hundreds of hours of volunteer time are contributed in support of manuscript peer review. There are occasions when a small number of manuscripts, or even a single manuscript, consumes an inordinate amount of time while processing the peer review. While every editor should strive to follow the IEEE guidelines closely, expenditure of such extraordinary amounts of time is not in keeping with the expectations for volunteer work. Fortunately, the editorial process for special issues incorporates additional safeguards compared to the usual peer review process, which can be used to alleviate extraordinary and unusual burdens on editors.

The list below enumerates a policy for allowing the technical editor (TE) of a special issue to provide a peer review of a manuscript assigned to that editor, in lieu of or in addition to the normal reviews provided by peers. As always, editors can provide peer reviews of manuscripts that are not under their responsibility for adjudication and decision. Lead editors (LE) have authority over TEs in the configuration of the special issue site in ScholarOne Manuscripts, and the special issue editor-in-chief (EIC) has authority over all editors associated with the special issue.

- This policy assumes that the TE has been assigned manuscripts in his or her area of expertise. That is, the TE should be qualified and capable of providing a review.
- TE should refrain from performing reviews if a normal review is possible. The essence of peer review is the solicitation of reviews from among members in the community at large.
- The peer review workflow also recognizes the need to complete reviews by deadlines, which sometimes is challenged by inability to identify suitable reviewers, inability to obtain commitments to review, inability to receive completed reviews, and other factors, despite the best efforts by editors. Since editing is a volunteer activity, such circumstances of overseeing peer review should not be so arduous.
- Therefore, it should be possible for TEs to provide peer review, provided that:
  - reasonable options for normal peer review have failed;
  - the TE has appropriate technical expertise, and is available to conduct the review;
  - the TE notifies the LE that the TE will provide a review for the paper;
  - the LE approves the TE action (note that LE can reject any improper review);
  - the EIC is notified (e.g. cc'd on e-mail correspondence)

- the TE excuses himself/herself from all manuscript decisions, which will be made instead by the LE.
- In ScholarOne Manuscripts, tools are available for the TE to exercise this option by selecting him/herself, inviting, agreeing, and returning the completed review. The lead editor may have to proxy for the TE when reviews have been returned and a decision is due.
- Lead editors may request revisions, which will still appear in the TE queue. The TE may again assign himself/herself as a reviewer of the revised manuscript following the procedure above.
- Since 1 editorial consideration is generally required to accept a paper, the EIC need not be consulted by the LE for accept decisions.
- Since 2 editorial considerations are generally requested to reject a paper, the EIC should be consulted by the LE for reject decisions. Note that we ask the lead editors to consult with the EIC on all reject decisions anyway, regardless of whether the TE has provided a review or not.