
ÉPISCIENCES PLATFORM: EDITOR'S GUIDE (A DIGEST).

by

The monitoring committee

Content of the website

Let us begin with a quick review of the different pages of the website and their content (the pages marked with the symbol * are only available when connected as an editor).

- **Homepage:** no need to comment.
- **Editorial board:** list of members (past and present).
- **News:** some more or less fresh news concerning the journal.
- **Information for the authors:** to help the authors to submit an article.
- **About the journal:** explanation concerning the specificity of the journal/composition of the monitoring committee/contact.
- **Articles:** different options to browse articles published in the journal.
- **Documents for the editors:** help for the editors.
- **EpiGA conference:** has been canceled due to pandemic crisis.
- **My account:** *When the user is not connected*, possibility to create an account. *When connected*, here is the information concerning the user: profile (possible to edit and modify), articles submitted, pending reviews, articles in charge (in case the user is an editor)...
- * **Dashboard:** roster of the journal. When clicking on "administrate articles", you access to the list of all articles managed. There is one row for each article with the ID, the status, the title, the volume, the section (another way to gather articles but we won't use it), the reviewers, the editors in charge, the author, the submission date and publication date (if any). The status is expressed by a symbol which looks like ⓘ and the color of the symbol depends on the status: grey=submitted (not

yet reviewed), blue=reviewed, orange=pending modifications or clarifications, green=accepted, red=rejected. There is also the same symbol next to the reviewer name and it informs you about the status (light gray=has not answered the invitation yet, gray=has not started reviewing, green=completed reviewing).

- * **Users:** list of users of the épiga platform (authors, reviewers, editors).
- * **Journal:** here you can edit new rating grids and have access to the managing page of the journal. If you need to do so please contact us.
- * **Mail:** you have access to the mailing and its history.

Tools for the editors

Let us detail the peer-review process using the platform, and the tools you, as an editor, can use on this platform.

Invitation of a reviewer. — When an article is submitted and you have been chosen as the editor who could handle it (either by the author or by the coordinator), you, as an editor, will receive a message about the submission. In case you do not feel to be the best person to handle the article, you have to get in touch with the coordinator. To do so, you can click on the button *I no longer wish to manage this article* ("Editors" field on the admin page of the article).

If you accept it, you first have to invite one or several reviewers. To do so, there are 2 options: from the dashboard (click on the mail picture in the reviewer cell) or from the administration page of the article (Journal→Article management). In case the author has suggested some unwanted reviewers, their names will appear on the invitation's window. There are 3 possibilities according to the status of the invited reviewer:

1. the reviewer is already a user of the journal.
2. the reviewer is not a user of the journal but has a CCSD account (maybe you can try to use this possibility when inviting a French person).
3. the reviewer does not have a CCSD account (yet). Here you have to fill in the form with the email of the reviewer who will be invited to create an account.

The platform generates an invitation message depending on the three cases above.

In case you would like to have a short opinion before starting a real review, you can use the same procedure as above, only changing the content of the generated email. If you prefer, you can of course also ask for these short opinions using your personal mailbox.

The invitation is valid during 2 months. If the invited reviewer answers positively he will receive a message (automatically generated) with the information to deliver his report (url of the administration page of the article). The editor in charge is also informed that the invitation is accepted. If the reviewer answers negatively, both him and the editor receive a message and the editor has to invite someone else. If the message is unanswered after 1 month, the editor is informed (automatic message) that he has to invite a new reviewer.

Note that the author can withdraw his submission until a reviewer has been assigned to it.

Reviewing the article. — Here is a specificity of the Episciences editorial system: the reviewer has the possibility to communicate directly with the author to ask for more details (for instance). The editor in charge can consult all the questions/answers on the administration page of the paper.

An automatic reminder is sent 15 days after the deadline to the editor (so that the latter can then get in touch with the reviewer in a more human way than an automatically generated reminder...).

Let us now give some details about the rating grid. We prepared 4 different criteria (but new ones can be edited):

1. ***Quick opinion:** if you need a first opinion before asking someone a full report. In this case the reviewer has to choose between 2 options: the article is worth being referred or not. There is also a field where he can write down a comment.
2. **Report:** this is the place to deliver a full report. There is a form to post comment and the reviewer can upload a file. He has also to choose the rating. The ratings are: Recommend the acceptance of this article/Ask for minor modifications/Ask for major modifications/Recommend to refuse this article.
3. ***Comment to the editors:** This field is meant to send a private message to the board (through a file upload or filling a text form).
4. **Minor corrections to the author:** Another chance to write a comment and to upload a file. For instance the reviewer can upload the pdf of the article with the annotations/corrections.

Fields marked with a star are only available for the editors.

It is important to note that the reviewer does not have to fill in all the criteria and can choose the ones relevant to deliver his review. For instance, in case he is invited to give a preliminary report, he can just use the *Quick opinion* criterion. When the reviewer delivers his report, the editor is automatically informed.

If you receive a report/quick opinion in your personal mail box, you have to options:

1. add it in the field *Comments of the editors* (bottom of the admin page);
2. forward it to `benoit.claudon@univ-rennes1.fr`: the report will be uploaded on behalf of the reviewer.

Taking a decision. — In view of the reports (and after the voting period), you have now to take a decision. You can do this using the box *Change article status* at the bottom of the administration page of the article. You can either accept/reject the article or ask for minor/major revisions. Actually there is not a big difference between minor and major revisions: the article will be handled in the same way in the platform when the author has been asked for minor or major revisions.

There is another option when clicking on the button *Change article status: Ask for other editors opinion*. You can use it to contact the board and suggest the acceptance/refusal of an article: you will get a pop-up window and you can edit the message before sending it to the other members of the editorial board.

Just a few words about asking revisions. First, please note the following important thing: when asking for a revision, you have the possibility to automatically reassign the reviewers or not. The second choice (no automatic message) is better but not mandatory. It is always preferable to avoid automatic message with reviewers and that's why the button for the automatic assignment is unchecked.

Once a modification is asked, the author can answer in 4 different ways:

- *Contact without sending a new version*: this choice opens an editable block. The author can use it to explain his opinion.
- *Answer without any modifications*: same as above. The difference concerns the status of the article: when using *Contact without sending a new version* the status remains unchanged (Pending for minor modifications); using *Answer without any modifications*, the article is considered as a new version.
- *Send a temporary version*: a file upload is available (and a comment form). The author can upload a new version of his article which will be visible only on Episciences.
- *Upload a new version*: the author uploads a new version on the open archive he used for the first submission and he can submit his new version as usual (giving the HAL/arXiv identifier, the version number and the name of the open repository).