Guidelines for Paper Reviewers (OAJPE)
10 Weeks from Submission to Publication

Guidelines on High Quality Papers

Significance
The specific problems/issues presented in the paper should be meaningful, and they should have some technical significance deserving of investigation.

Originality
The paper should contain original contributions that are innovative and have a potential impact on academic research, industry application or both. Originality should be made evident in the early parts of the paper, and the case should be made by citing literature to, for example, describe the state-of-the-art and highlight the research gap. The introduction, aims and objectives, discussion and conclusion should all reflect this originality. For application papers the importance and relevance of the problem addressed and the usefulness of the contribution for the practicing community are also of great importance.

Rigor
The research work conducted to support, validate, or demonstrate the paper’s contribution should have a certain degree of technical depth and scientific rigor. In other words, rigor should be evident from the meat of the paper – strong and extensive (i.e. substantial) datasets rigorously analyzed, and where relevant marrying experimental, analytical and numerical work.

Effective Presentation
The paper’s texts and illustrations should communicate the contents effectively, the paper should be well structured, and the IEEE Power and Energy Society (PES) Journal Template should be followed.

Types of Papers

OAJPE will consider 6 types of papers.

Type 1: Research Papers
Research papers are expected to present innovative solutions, novel concepts, or creative ideas that address existing or emerging technical challenges in the field of power engineering. OAJPE welcomes research papers that are visionary and promise significant future advances.

Type 2: Application Papers
Application papers are expected to share valuable industry experiences on dealing with challenging technical issues, developing/adopting new standards, applying new technologies, or solving complex
problems. OAJPE welcomes application papers that will have a significant impact on future industry practices.

Example: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9006796

Type 3: Hybrid Papers
Hybrid papers combine features of Type 1 and Type 2 papers.

Type 4: Review Papers
Review papers are expected to provide insightful and expert reviews, tutorials, or case studies on an important, timely topic of wide interest in the electric power and energy systems fields. Review papers are to be in-depth, critical analyses. Reviews may be undertaken on a broad subject area or on a very specific topic, and are expected to be more than just a survey of the literature accompanied by a long list of references. OAJPE welcomes reviews that present the state-of-the-art along with critical issues that have been solved as well as challenges that remain unresolved.


Type 5: Visionary Papers
Visionary papers are designed for seasoned researchers to share their visions on a significant trend or technical challenge facing the power industry or to present innovative or emerging ideas/concepts that may produce a wide range of impacts. A paper of this type is intended to promote, influence or lead research activities in the subject area.


Type 6: Working Group and Task Force Papers
Working Group (WG) and Task Force (TF) papers are prepared by WGs and TFs working on topics relevant to the journal. The review process will be as rigorous as other papers. In addition, the PES publication board has established a policy that a WG/TF paper must be written using a standard format.


Note, OAJPE considers short papers for Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3 papers. The technical merits of short papers should be aligned with IEEE Power and Energy Society Letters (PESL). Initial submission is limited to 3 pages and the final accepted version should be within 4 pages. OAJPE does not consider short papers for Type 4-6 papers.

Review Principles

Recognition of Reviewers
The success of the journal depends on reviewers' efforts and timely completion of review tasks. Outstanding reviewers will be recognized by the Journal annually and their names will be published on the journal homepage.

Declining to Review a Paper
If a paper assigned to you is outside your area of expertise or you do not have experience publishing journal grade papers in relevant area, please do not feel that you are obligated to review. We recommend that you decline such a review request. This approach is much better than providing an ill-informed review, since the editor could be misled by the comments and make an inappropriate recommendation on the paper.

If you wish to decline to review a paper, we ask that you let the editor know immediately, and we encourage you to suggest alternative reviewers. This will enable the editor to find a new reviewer in a timely manner. It is acceptable to decline a review request. It is unfair to the peer review process if you do not let the editor know your intention not to review.

**Review Decisions**

The objective of this journal is to publish high quality papers within 10 weeks from submission. To achieve this goal, there are only two options for reviewers: **Accept Without Changes or With Minor Revision** and **Reject**. Traditional “major revision” in other journals may lead to a rejection recommendation by a reviewer of this journal.

A published paper typically goes through 2 rounds of editing/review: the first (initial) round and the second (revision) round. It is highly recommended for each reviewer to complete the first round review within 3 weeks and the second round review within 1 week (see the “Timeline of Paper Review” section).

Additional guidelines for reviewers can be found at: [https://www.ieee-pes.org/part-8-reviewer-and-editor-guidelines](https://www.ieee-pes.org/part-8-reviewer-and-editor-guidelines)

**Timeline of Paper Review**

![Timeline of OAJPE review process](image)

Figure 1. Typical timeline of OAJPE review process

Figure 1 shows the timeline of the typical OAJPE review process in 10 weeks from submission to publication with two rounds of reviews (initial and revision rounds). The general review process and duration are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>EIC screens and assigns the paper to a proper editor who assigns the paper to reviewers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 2-4</td>
<td>First round review within 3 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>First round decision by the editor and EIC in Week 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 5-7</td>
<td>Author(s) may revise and resubmit the paper within 3 weeks (for non-major revisions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>EIC assigns the paper to proper editor who assigns the paper to reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>Second Round Review within 1 week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Final Decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of Papers

Initial submission must be within 10 pages, and the final accepted version must be within 12 pages.

Paper Template

IEEE PES Authors' Kit:
https://www.ieee-pes.org/publications/information-for-authors

Paper template:

Meet the Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Fangxing "Fran" Li
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996 USA
fli6@utk.edu

About this Document

Under the supervision of the EIC, this document was developed during the period of November 2020 to March 2021 by the OAJPE Task Force (TF) on Website of Resource which consists of the following members:

**Xiao-Ping Zhang (TF Lead),** University of Birmingham, UK
Yonghong Chen, Midcontinent Independent System Operator, USA
Steve Glover, Sandia National Laboratories, USA
Panos Kotsampopoulos, National Technical University of Athens, Greece
Masood Parvania, University of Utah, USA
Zhaoyu Wang, Iowa State University, USA