

SHARING EXPERIENCES, PRACTICES & CASES

TSG editorial policies, AE guidance, and examples

TSG Editorial Policies and AE Guidance

- AE must **show respect and consideration to authors** and their papers, **treating papers as they would like their own papers to be treated**.
- **3-5 reviews are needed to make a recommendation, with a minimum of 3 solid reviews** (i.e. detailed and not single paragraph reviews), irrespective of the reviewer recommendations.
- AE should **avoid inviting lots of reviewers** so as not to end up with too many reviews.
- **2 solid reviewer rejections should be an automatic rejection, but 3 solid reviews are still needed to make a recommendation**, as per due process and to show authors that adequate consideration has been given to their work.

TSG Editorial Policies and AE Guidance

- AEs should **rescind reviews and reviewers that provide meaningless or no feedback**, irrespective of their recommendation and the number of secured reviews, not invite them again, and **flag the reviewers' accounts for other AEs**.
- If **not enough strong reviews**, or when **not satisfied with the reviews**, or when the **paper has been in the system for more than 90 days**, AE should **review the paper and provide detailed comments** to EIC, if 2 other good reviews have been secured.
- **Reviewers' recommendations should not be ignored**, regardless of comments, as this is their final judgement for the record.
- To recommend a **rejection with only one or none reviewer rejection, proper and strong justification of AE recommendation should be provided**, regardless of review cycle, for the record and as per due process.

TSG Editorial Policies and AE Guidance

- Once reviewers have timely accepted to review a paper, AEs **should not rescind them unless late or for inappropriate/poor reviews.**
- A **first revision with a properly supported rejection from a reviewer should be rejected, with proper justification from the AE,** to tighten up standards and avoid a possible rejection on a second round of revisions. However, **if the AE feels that the authors should be given another chance, he/she should make a proper argument** for a second revision.
- A **final decision should be made on a second revision** to avoid endless review cycles, which means that **if still significant issues remain, the paper may be rejected with properly supported** and significant **Revised and Resubmit** recommendations.

TSG Editorial Policies and AE Guidance

- If the **AE strongly believes that a third and very last review cycle** is still necessary, as the required changes are significant enough but readily addressable, the **recommendation should be properly substantiated**.
- **Reviewers who accept a paper in a revision cycle should not be invited again**, to avoid overburdening reviewers with unnecessary requests.
- If a reviewer rejects or recommends R&R for a new or revised submission, and then declines to review the revision, or does not respond in a reasonable time (more than 60 days), the **AE should make a recommendation specifically indicating to the EIC whether the comments of the missing reviewer have been addressed**. This is especially **important if the reviewer rejected the paper in the previous cycle**.

TSG Editorial Policies and AE Guidance

- **New reviewers should not be invited to review revisions**, as this is unfair to the authors; however, if the AE strongly believes that additional input is required to make a recommendation (e.g. conflicting reviews or too few reviews), a new reviewer may be invited.
- **AEs cannot make recommendations with pending reviews within deadlines**; pending reviewers should be contacted first to make sure that they have not started the review.

TSG Sample Emails to AEs

- Thanks for your recommendation; however, since the **paper was rejected by only one reviewer**, and considering my email to AEs that **such papers should be given a chance, for the benefit of the authors**, I need you to **explain in detail in your comments to the authors why you think the paper should be rejected**. Hence, the paper is back on your AE dashboard, so that you can provide these details.
- Thanks for your recommendation; however, I need you to **specifically comment on whether and how the concerns of the reviewer who did not respond**, and rejected the paper in the previous round, **were addressed in the revision**, for the record and as per due process, especially considering that the other reviewers still have concerns. Hence, the paper is back on your AE dashboard so that you can take care of this issue.

TSG Sample Emails to AEs

- Thanks for your recommendation, with which I agree. However, as I've indicated before, we **need a minimum of 3 strong reviews** (the last one in this case is 2 unsubstantiated sentences), as per PES Editorial policy and due process, for the sake and reputation of the journal. Please note that **when it's not possible to timely secure 3 reviews, I'm asking AEs to provide a review themselves**, but that is not the case here, Hence, the paper is back on your AE dashboard so that you can take care of this issue.

TSG Sample Emails to AEs

- Thanks for your recommendation, with which I agree. However, the **deadline for a reviewer hasn't passed**, and hence, as I've mentioned to you before, **the colleague should be contacted to make sure that he has not already started reviewing the paper**, to avoid issues that we have faced in the past with reviewers upset with being rescinded before the deadline and after spending time reviewing the paper. As you'd probably agree and mentioned in an email I sent to AEs on this subject, **we need to be mindful of this to avoid upsetting reviewers on whom we depend**. Hence, the paper is back on your AE dashboard so that you can take care of this admin. issue.

QUESTIONS?

Presenter Bio

Claudio Cañizares, Ph.D., P.Eng., FIEEE, FRSC, FCAE

University Professor and Hydro One Endowed Chair

- Dr. Claudio Cañizares is a University Professor and Hydro One Chair at the ECE Department of the University of Waterloo, where he has been since 1993. His highly cited research focuses on modeling, simulation, computation, stability, control, and optimization of power and energy systems. He is the IEEE Trans. Smart Grid EIC; PES Director-Elect to the IEEE Board; a Fellow of the IEEE, the Royal Society of Canada, and the Canadian Academy of Engineering; and has received the 2017 IEEE PES Outstanding Educator Award, the 2016 IEEE Canada Electric Power Medal, and multiple awards and recognitions from PES Technical Committees.

