
**OPERATING RULES FOR
ÉPIJOURNAL DE GÉOMÉTRIE ALGÈBRIQUE.**

by

Pierre-Emmanuel Chaput, Benoît Claudon, Lucas Fresse, Alain
Genestier, Damien Mégy, Gianluca Pacienza, and Matei Toma

Title and Goal

The title of the journal is *Épjournal de Géométrie Algébrique* (shortened as *EpiGA*). The goal of the journal is to publish research articles (*via* the platform *Épisciences*) in the area of Algebraic Geometry (and related fields, such as the geometry of compact Kähler manifolds, algebraic groups and representation theory, arithmetic geometry).

Épjournal de Géométrie Algébrique aims at publishing articles achieving the highest scientific standards like other international journals such as *Compositio Mathematica*.

The number of articles published per year is not yet fixed.

Organization of the journal

The composition of the journal is the following

- the editors (11 in 2019).
- the coordinator: he/she is an editor with a particular function and serves a five-year term.
- the monitoring committee: it deals with the practical aspects of the journal (*e.g.*, the website) and it provides continuity for journal's life.

Operating Rules

Peer review process. — In order to illustrate the procedure chosen by the monitoring committee, let us describe the peer review process of a paper submitted to *Épijournal de Géométrie Algébrique*.

1. *Via* the platform Épisciences, the author submits a paper to the journal and has the opportunity to indicate the choice of an editor to handle the paper. If the author doesn't choose any editor, the coordinator has to decide who will be in charge of the paper (including himself).
2. To deal with the submitted paper, the editor can ask for pre-reports to get an opinion on the interest of the paper. He may then choose one or two referees who have to produce a complete report on the validity and the originality of the paper.
3. The total duration of the peer review process should not exceed six months.
4. In view of the reports, the editor takes a decision on the publication of the paper. In case of a negative decision, the paper is rejected (no need to consult the other editors). In the case of a positive decision, this decision is forwarded to the editorial board and is pending for two weeks, unless some editor wishes to have additional time to look closely at the paper subject to vote. Then the decision is pending for two weeks.
5. If no other opinion arises during this notice notice period, the paper is definitely accepted for publication. On the contrary, if at least two other editors produce a (motivated) negative opinion on the paper, then it is rejected and those editors have to produce a report explaining their decision to the author. If at least one editor (in addition to the editor in charge of the paper) produces a positive opinion whereas there is no more than one negative opinion, the paper is accepted. Finally if there is one negative opinion and no positive opinion, the paper is rejected.
6. Of course every opinion must be argued and detailed.

Composition of the editorial board. — On 2020 September, the editorial board is the following:

1. V. Alexeev, university of Georgia
2. D. Arinkin, University of Wisconsin, Madison
3. J. Ayoub, Zurich university
4. M. Brion, IF/CNRS, Grenoble
5. P. Brosnan, University of Maryland
6. A. Cadoret, IMJ-PRG, Paris
7. S. Druel, Lyon/CNRS
8. X. He, university of Maryland

9. S. Payne, University of Texas at Austin
10. M. Verbitsky, HSE (Moscou)/IMPA (Rio de Janeiro)
11. E. Viehmann, TUM, München

History of renewals:

2018 February : Anna Cadoret (IMJ, Paris) joined the board.

2019 September : Frédéric Campana, Dennis Gaitsgory, Michaël Rapoport and Guy Rousseau left the board (partial renewal to avoid a complete one in 2021). Dima Arinkin, Patrick Brosnan and Eva Viehmann entered the board.

2020 June : Ravi Vakil left the board (replaced with Sam Payne).

Renewal of the editorial board. — The term of editor is of five years. At the end of this term, the monitoring committee may propose a second (three-year) term to the editor. Editors may not serve more than two consecutive terms. In the case where an editor decides to leave the editorial board before the end of his term, he/she is required to propose the name of one or several persons likely to replace him/her. This list will be submitted for approval to the monitoring committee, which will choose the new editor among the list or, possibly, outside.

Considering the exceptional situation of an editor having a heavily inappropriate behaviour, he/she could be dismissed with the consent of a majority of editors and the whole monitoring committee.

Role of the coordinator. — The coordinator serves a five-year term. After this period the editor who was in charge of his function stays in the editorial board, and the monitoring committee chooses a new coordinator.

The coordinator has to assign submitted articles when no editor was chosen by the authors.

The coordinator is in relation with the monitoring committee, especially concerning the platform and its use.

She/he ensures that the present *operating rules* are respected.

Functions of the monitoring committee. — The monitoring committee ensures the continuity of journal's life.

The monitoring committee is in particular responsible for the update of the website (hosted by the platform Épisciences) and for the parametrization of

the platform (at least initially).

The monitoring committee names the coordinator among the members of the editorial board (this nomination occurs at the creation of the journal and then at every renewal of the function). It gives its approval for naming a new editor.

During the initial moments of journal's life, the monitoring committee shall encourage submission of new articles.

Some tasks are common to all members of the monitoring committee: first contact with the editors, appointment of the coordinator, replacement of editors and, for the first issues of the journal, to appeal to colleagues for possible new submissions.

Some other tasks will be carried out by one or two persons in particular: update of the website, parametrization of the platform and communication.

At the moment of creation of the journal, the members of the committee are Pierre-Emmanuel Chaput, Benoît Claudon, Lucas Fresse, Alain Genestier, Damien Mégy, Arvid Perego, and Matei Toma. Then afterwards any leaving member will be replaced with a person chosen by the other members of the committee.

History of renewals:

in 2018 : Arvid Perego left the monitoring committee and was replaced with Gianluca Pacienza.