

2. Editorial & Review Process

2.1. Peer-Review Process Update

Each paper is evaluated by 2-3 reviewers, and their comments, along with the editor's assessment, guide the outcome. Below, we describe the possible decisions and how they are made.

Peer Review Model

All research articles are sent to three independent experts in the field. These reviewers assess the manuscript's originality, theoretical and methodological strength, writing quality, and relevance to the journal's scope. Their feedback is crucial but advisory. The final decision rests with the editor, who considers both the reviewers' opinions and the journal's overall standards.

2.2 Decision Categories for Manuscripts

Decision Categories

Accept

A manuscript is accepted if it meets the journal's expectations with no substantial revisions required. This generally happens when all the reviewers support acceptance, or when two are in favor and the third suggests only minor edits. The editor still reads through everything to confirm the paper is solid—methodologically, ethically, and stylistically. Once accepted, the article moves forward to copyediting and publication.

Minor Revision

This decision is given when the paper is fundamentally strong but needs small adjustments. These could include tightening the language, fixing reference formats, clarifying a few points, or improving a figure. It's common when two or three reviewers note minor issues, or when the paper is nearly ready but needs a final polish. Authors are usually given a short time (eg. 10 working days) to make the necessary corrections, and the editor may not send it back to reviewers if the changes are straightforward.

Major Revision

Major revisions are requested when the paper shows potential but has serious areas that need improvement. This could involve clarifying the methodology, strengthening the theoretical base, improving the structure, or expanding the analysis. If two reviewers recommend major changes, or if the reviews are mixed but one raises significant concerns, the editor will usually lean toward major revision. Authors are expected to submit a detailed response and revised manuscript. Often, the revised version is sent back to the same reviewers for re-evaluation.

A special note here: if a manuscript has a strong conceptual or theoretical core but the methods section is weak, editors may still allow a major revision rather than rejecting the paper. This is especially true if the research design can be fixed without collecting new data or rewriting the entire study.

Reject

A manuscript is rejected if it doesn't meet the academic standards of the journal and cannot be fixed through revision. This could be due to a lack of originality, serious methodological flaws, ethical issues, or because the content simply falls outside the journal's focus. If all three reviewers recommend rejection, or if two do and the editor agrees with their reasoning, the decision will be final. While editors aim to offer helpful feedback, a "reject" decision typically closes the review process.

When Reviewers Disagree

It's not unusual for reviewers to offer different opinions. One might recommend acceptance, another a minor revision, and a third could suggest rejection. In these cases, the editor doesn't just go with the majority. Instead, they read the manuscript carefully, consider the strength of each argument, and assess whether the paper can realistically meet the journal's standards. Sometimes, the editor will ask a fourth reviewer for an additional opinion. Other times, they may discuss the case with a member of the editorial board before making a decision.

Editorial Judgment

Reviewers help editors see a manuscript from different angles—but the final responsibility for the decision lies with the editor. If reviewers miss something important, the editor can still reject the paper. If one reviewer is overly harsh or vague, the editor might disregard that review and lean on the others. In some cases, an editor may request a revision even when two reviewers suggest acceptance, simply because they noticed an issue that must be addressed before publication.

Decisions are never made lightly. The goal is to ensure fairness to the authors, uphold the journal's academic standards, and maintain the integrity of the review process.