Instructions of Section Editors

General Overview

Section Editors of this journal have obligation to judge the manuscripts on their merits, there are mainly four jobs (usually just three) to do as follows:

1. Find appropriate reviews for the manuscript.

2. Comprehend reviews’ comments, and make a primary decision.

3. If the manuscript needs revision, send it back to the author with the comments from the reviewers (The section editor could add some revision advise as well). After the revised manuscript is returned by the Author(s), look over the revised version and make sure the Author(s) has done the revision as request.

4. After adequate revision, the manuscript could be accepted as the preprint version which is waiting for the layout edit scheduling.

Right scheme is an illustration of how the manuscript is handled by the section editor.

Author
M There will be an Email sent by the online system to notify the Author.

Section Editor
M There will be an Email sent by the online system to notify the Section Editor.

Reviewer
M There will be an Email sent by the online system to notify the Reviewer.
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.
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.
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sent Time: 2000-5-23</th>
<th>Finish Time: 2000-6-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manucript Appraise:
- Standard of English: Good
- Originality of Research: Ordinary
- Clarity of Text: Good

### Reviewer's conclusion: Accept

First reviewer's conclusion: Accept

Second reviewer's conclusion: Accept

### Reviewing Conclusion

*“Send for Revision” only appears when you choose “Revision Required”.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*“Finalize” only appears when you choose “Accept” or “Reject.”*

### Supplementary files for the comments.

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

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