

Peer Review Policy

Journal of Digital Science (JDS) follows a double-blind peer review model. In line with the aims and mission of this journal, papers are normally peer reviewed by two independent academic experts, and additional or supplementary reviews by experts from the policy community may be sought to ensure high-quality, impactful publications that are both academically rigorous and policy relevant.

Reviewers are expected to observe the Ethics Policy of JDS, including the documents referenced in it, and are encouraged to read and observe the COPE ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. Those who oversee the peer review process are expected to recognize warning signs of misconduct and to report any concerns to the editorial office.

The criteria used to evaluate manuscripts include their alignment with the journal's mission, aims and scope, adherence to accepted academic standards for originality, significance, and rigor, as well as the quality of research and analysis.

The acceptance decisions will take into account paper novelty, technical depth, elegance, practical or theoretic impact, and presentation:

Soundness: The contributions should be supported by the rigorous application of appropriate research methods.

Significance: The authors are expected to argue the relevance and usefulness of their research and discuss the novelty through a comparison with related works.

Novelty: The contributions should be original and explained clearly and correctly concerning state-of-the-art.

Replicability: The contributions will take into account the extent to which sufficient information is available to support the full or partial independent replication of the claimed findings.

Presentation Quality: The submissions are expected to meet high standards of presentation, including the English language, avoiding ambiguities, clearly readable figures and tables, and respect of the formatting instructions.

The reviewers will identify and note any minor issues that require correction, such as ensuring the correct references are cited and avoiding excessive, limited, or biased citations. Additionally, the reviewer will check for factual, numerical, or unit errors and report any that are found. And are all tables and figures appropriately labeled, sufficient, and relevant?

Type of reviewers' report

The editor or editorial board of the journal will consider the feedback provided by the peer reviewers and will use this information to come to a decision. In addition to the comments received from reviewing, the Editors also base their decisions on the following: JDS aims and intended readership; State of the art in the field concerned; and the level of competition for acceptance and for page space in the journal.

Reviewers can report one of the following decision types (see Table below).

Type of reviewers' report

Acceptance		Rejection	
<i>qualified</i>	<i>conditional</i>	<i>conditional</i>	<i>outright</i>
The journal publishes the paper as is or asks the author for minor corrections.	The journal will publish the paper on the condition that the authors make the changes suggested by the reviewers and/or editors.	After the authors make major changes, the journal is willing to reconsider the paper in another round of decision making.	Even if the authors make major revisions, the journal will not publish or reconsider the paper.

The decision letter is accompanied by the reviewers' reports and the editor's commentary. The commentary explains the reasons for the decision. If revisions are required, the decision letter and the reviewers' reports will clearly state the specific changes that are needed, allowing the author to respond to each point. Each point can be addressed by authors in turn. The Editor-in-Chief reserves the right to revise the decision of the reviewers in exceptional cases.

Make changes and submit to a different journal

If Authors decide to try a different journal, they should not use submitted to JDS version and title of their paper. Make sure that authors adjust Title, Abstract, key words, referencing and any other journal specific details before submitting to a different Publisher.