

# **CAPjournal: Guide for Peer Reviewers**

## **Reviewers**

Reviewers are one of the most important assets of a journal and we are very grateful to our talented pool of reviewers for their qualified and irreplaceable work.

Reviewers are selected from experts in the field who are either sought out or approach us with an interest in being involved in the reviewing process. Papers may be submitted for evaluation to at least one reviewer.

## **Final decision**

The Editor and Editorial Board decide upon the acceptance of each paper on the basis of the general CAPjournal editorial policy and of the peer review reports, in accordance with the following criteria:

- comparison of the different reports on the paper (in case of drastically different evaluations one or more adjudicators are consulted);
- balance of the evaluations of the different papers;
- consideration of the backlog of papers;
- consideration of the numbers of papers published in different fields.

## **Peer Review Reports**

The Editor keeps in contact with the reviewers via email. When a reviewer is asked to produce a report, she/he should reply to the Editor as soon as possible, stating whether she/he accepts to act as a reviewer and stating any possible conflicts of interest. In the case of a negative answer, the suggestion of (an) other reviewer(s) is warmly appreciated. Reviewers are asked to produce a report by filling in the peer review template (see below) and, if necessary, commenting on the article text using track changes (in Word) or edits (in PDF).

Reports should be written in such a way as to help the final decision and the communication with the authors. Suggested changes to a paper should be clearly stated. Note that in most cases the editor will judge whether the reviewer's comments have been adequately met and the reviewer will not see the amended paper.

The Reviewer is invited to conclude her/his assessment with one of the following recommendations:

- Accept the paper as it is
- Reject
- Ask the authors to revise the paper according to the lines expressed by the referee's report

Reviewers will be given a deadline to produce their report when a paper is sent to them, which will usually be in the region of one week and this is usually negotiable. In case they need more time, cannot produce their report in a reasonable time, or are at all unable to produce a report, they are asked to contact the Editor as soon as is possible. Reports should be transmitted to the Editor by Email to the address: [editor@capjournal.org](mailto:editor@capjournal.org)

## **CAPjournal: Peer Review Report Template**

Author:

Reviewer:

Date:

### **Suggested section of the journal (delete as appropriate)**

Best Practice

Column

Announcement

Research and Applications

Review

### **Originality of the paper**

### **Potential interest/relevance for the science communication community**

### **Conformity with the scope of the Journal which aims to share best practice in astronomy engagement and communication**

### **Correctness of the results and clarity of exposition**

### **English grammar if necessary**

### **Balance between the length of a paper and its interest**

### **Summary**

Please indicate whether you would recommend the paper for publication