



## Initial evaluation

Initial evaluation, also known as initial assessment is an essential procedure for the English journals, to provide the quickest service for authors, avoid the over-burdening of referees and ensure the high quality of the manuscript. Only those manuscripts which pass this initial review process will be forwarded to referees for further review.

A manuscript may be returned to the author(s) without external review if, in the opinion of the Editor, the manuscript falls into one or more of the following categories:

- the manuscript clearly falls outside the scope of the journal;
- the work is of poor scientific quality such that it is clearly not suitable for publication in a top-tier scientific journal;
- the manuscript is of insufficient general interest for the journal and would be better suited to a more specialised journal;
- the novelty of the work falls below that required for the journal;
- the manuscript represents undue fragmentation of the research into multiple papers;
- the manuscript contains redundant information or significant amounts of material that has already been published elsewhere or is under consideration by another journal;
- the quality of the English in the manuscript is so poor as to render the science presented unclear;
- the manuscript has already been reviewed and rejected by a different RSC journal, and the author(s) have made little or no attempt to address the advice of the Editor and/or referees already given;
- the conclusions drawn by the manuscript are well known or have been previously published.

Authors have the right to appeal against any decision taken on their manuscript at any stage. In the case of an appeal, further opinions will be sought on the manuscript's suitability for publication in the journal. After the appeal process the Editor's decision is final.

## Peer review

Peer reviewing is an essential step for the acceptance of a scientific manuscript. There are few points should be noted as follows:

1. The peer reviewing process could be done by clicking on the right side of the page. Check the following picture for detailed description. (click on the open the bigger picture)
2. After the manuscript is sent to the reviewer(s), it will be listed in "Unreviewed manuscript". The online system will remind the reviewers for the deadline of reviewing automatically. The section editor may sent the reviewer the reminding Email manually by clicking "Chase Reviewer". But if there is no response from the reviewer(s), the section editor have to click "choose reviewer" again for other reviewers.
3. The manuscript should be send to the reviewers(usually two) which are familiar with the researching field. The reviewers who have confliction of interests or close personal connection with the Author(s) should be avoided.
4. If the manuscript is rejected the reviewer, the online system will send a E-mail to notify the section editor for the renewal of reviewer.
5. The section editor shall send the manuscript to himself(herself) if feel adequate for the reviewing. But DO make sure the judging of the quality of the manuscript is objective.

**Attention: 4 Record of unfinished reviewing. Now Reviewing List**

Status	Review Session	Date	Reviewer
Rejected	Reviewing	2008-4-1 12:32:05	ghsha
Unfinished	Reviewing	2008-4-1 12:33:17	zhum
Rejected	Reviewing	2008-6-19 9:07:06	klhan
Unfinished	Reviewing	2008-6-23 8:27:48	eyfeng

Manuscript No. [redacted]  
 Title [redacted] [Click Here to select reviewer from the Database](#) [Add new reviewer to the Database](#)

Review Session:  \*

Reviewer:   \*

The usernames of the Referees could be typed in directly when you know them clearly. Separate with "," if there are several names. Example:wangjx,lijx,ddy

Manuscript Status:  [Recommended reviewer List. Click here to add.](#)

Suggested reviewers to include (By reviewer)

Name	Title	Major	Affiliation	PostcodeTel	E-Mail	Suggested user	Add reviewer
gh sha	Prof.	Chem	Dicp	[redacted]	[redacted]	klhan	<a href="#">Add reviewer</a>
hm tian	Prof.	Phys	Szpt	[redacted]	[redacted]	ghsha	<a href="#">Add reviewer</a>

Here are several comments from other Referee, you can send them to the reviewer by clicking on them. [Returned comments list](#)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Review process	Reviewer	Review-date	Reviewer Conclusion	Editor Conclusion	View Advice
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reviewing	hmtian (Referee History)	2008-06-07	Accept	Unfinished	<a href="#">View Advice</a>

[Upload the verified version if the origin file has any problems.](#)

[After choosing the properiate, click "Submit" to send Emails to the Reviewers](#)

## Request revision

Most manuscripts require a revision before accepted by the section editor. Even for those well written manuscripts might have minor imperfections. After the comments are returned by the reviewers (the manuscript(s) could be found in “Reviewed manuscript”), section editor should send them to the author with the additional comments from the section editor him/herself. LOOK INTO the picture below for particular instructions.

No. [redacted] Title: [redacted]

Reviewing Step: [redacted] Reviewer: [redacted] Sent Time: 2008-5-23 Finish Time: 2008-6-19

---

Remind: This file could be download by the Author (s) too. Please make sure it does not contain any information of the reviewer.

Attachment List (Editors can also upload any relevant attachment here.)

File Description	File Name	Allowance For Author
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Allow <input type="radio"/> Forbid <input type="button" value="Upload"/> <input type="button" value="Delete"/>

[Supplementary files for the comments.](#)

---

The following contents will be sent to the Author(s). Please add your comments and advice.

second reviewer's ( [redacted] ) advice:

Manuscript Appraise: Comments Text field. All the detailed comments are listed in the field, you may also add some comments for the Author(s).

Standard of English: Good

Originality of Research: Ordinary

Clarity of Text: Good

---

first reviewer's ( [redacted] ) Conclusion: **Accept**  
second reviewer's ( [redacted] ) Conclusion: **Accept**

**Reviewing Conclusion** Your conclusion for the manuscript.

**Adopt**  Accept "Send for Revision" only appears when you choose "Revision Required".

**Revision**  Wait for Final  Revision Before  Accept after  Sent for Review  
Required Recommendation Peer Reviewing Minor Revision after Revision

**Reject**  Reject After  Resubmit after  Rejected  Not Suitable for CJCP  
Initial Assessment Revision

---

Send for Revision Click on the square to show the options for Revision Request

---

Due Time:  Please Select a particular Date(Default: 30 Days Afterwards)

---

Language of the E-mail:  The allowance for the origin commets. Click to save and Email the Author.

Author Allowance:  Allow  Forbid Click Here to see the origin comments.

## Final decision

The manuscript could be finalized by section editor after take full consideration of the reviewer comments and the author revisions(if there is any). The basic page for finalization is the same as revision requesting. LOOK INTO the picture below for particular instructions.

No. [REDACTED]	Title: [REDACTED]						
Reviewing Step: [REDACTED]	Reviewer: [REDACTED]	Sent Time: 2008-5-23	Finish Time: 2008-6-19				
<a href="#">Download the Manuscript</a>	<a href="#">Upload the Verified Version</a>						
Remind: This file could be download by the Author(s) too. Please make sure it does not contain any information of the reviewer.							
Attachment List (Editors can also upload any relevant attachment here.)							
<b>File Description</b>	<b>File Name</b>	<b>Allowance For Author</b>					
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Allow	<input type="radio"/> Forbid	<a href="#">Upload</a>	<a href="#">Delete</a>		
<a href="#">Add More Attachments</a>		<a href="#">Supplementary files for the comments.</a>					
The following contents will be sent to the Author(s). Please add your comments and advice.							
Manuscript Appraise:		<a href="#">Comments Text field. All the detailed comments are listed in the field, you may also add some comments for the Author(s).</a>					
Standard of English: Good							
Originality of Research: Ordinary							
Clarity of Text: Good							
Reviewer's conclusion: Accept							
first reviewer's ([REDACTED]) Conclusion: Accept							
second reviewer's ([REDACTED]) Conclusion: Accept		<a href="#">Your conclusion for the manuscript.</a>					
<b>Reviewing Conclusion</b>		<a href="#">"Send for Revision" only appears when you choose "Revision Required".</a>					
Adopt <input checked="" type="radio"/> Accept		<a href="#">"Finalize" only appears when you choose "Accept" or "Reject".</a>					
Revision <input type="radio"/> Wait for Final		<input type="radio"/> Revision Before		<input type="radio"/> Accept after		<input type="radio"/> Sent for Review	
Required Recommendation		Peer Reviewing		Minor Revision		after Revision	
Reject <input type="radio"/> Reject After		<input type="radio"/> Resubmit after		<input type="radio"/> Rejected		<input type="radio"/> Not Suitable	
Initial Assessment Revision						for CJCF	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Finalize <a href="#">Click on the square to finalize and finish the reviewing procedure.</a>							
Language of the E-mail: English		<a href="#">The allowance for the origin commets.</a>		<a href="#">Click to save and Email the Author.</a>			
Author Allowance: <input type="radio"/> Allow <input checked="" type="radio"/> Forbid		<a href="#">Click Here to see the origin comments.</a>		<a href="#">Save Your Advice</a>		<a href="#">Cancel</a>	