

GUIDELINES FOR THE EDITORS OF LOGICAL METHODS IN COMPUTER SCIENCE

Your work will be supported by the Episciences software system. The goal of Episciences is to enable you to conduct all your editorial work online through the web interface. You do not need to keep editorial records in your personal files: everything is at your disposal on your personal account through the Episciences web page. Referees and authors can also follow the development of the refereeing process (as far as desirable) on their pages, but all their interactions are mediated by you.

You can view the state of any paper you are handling in your *Dashboard* or under "[My Account → Assigned Articles](#)". By clicking on a paper's title, you access a page with all the paper's information, including assigned editors and reviewers. A very useful feature is the "*History*" box, which displays in different colours the timeline of events associated with that paper—in particular, any interaction between the editor, authors and reviewers through the Episciences system is going to be logged automatically in the timeline.

1. SUBMISSION RECEIVED

Authors are requested to submit using the online submission procedure of the Episciences system, which means in particular that they should upload their paper on arXiv prior to submission. All the details, as well as the reasons behind this policy, can be found in "*Authors → Instructions for Authors*". Please do not allow authors to send you papers directly: if someone does, ask them to submit properly and refer to the page "[For Authors → Information](#)" page. This is the only communication with the author that you should perform outside of the editor webpage.

Authors choose a handling editor when they submit. If you are assigned as the handling editor, then please send a message to the authors confirming that the refereeing has started within two week. If you do not want to handle the paper, then you should refuse to handle the submission by pressing the button "*I no longer wish to manage this article*" in the "*Editors*" box or contact the Editor-in-Chief (outside of the system). Refusing to handle a paper can be for various reasons: if you do not feel to have the right expertise, the paper will be assigned to another editor; if instead you judge that the paper is not in the scope of LMCS or does not even meet the standards to enter the reviewing process, you may rejected the submission immediately (possibly consulting with the Editor-in-Chief).

2. CHOICE OF REVIEWERS

The "*Reviewers*" box (under [My Account → Assigned Articles](#) → article page) shows the current status of any review associated with a submitted paper.

As an editor, you can invite a new reviewer to review a submitted paper by clicking on the associated button at the bottom of the "*Reviewers*" box. The minimum number of reviewers you are requested to ask is two, and we expect two or three reviewers to be the common practice.

When you invite a reviewer, a page opens where you should first check whether that person is among the “*Known reviewers from the journal*” (there is an input line to search through existing reviewers). If not, then click on the button “+ *New reviewer...*” at the bottom of the page. Then first check under “*Invite a known user*” whether the reviewer already has an account (but wasn’t a reviewer for LMCS or has used that account with other services of CCSD than Episciences). **Only if that also fails**, then you should supply information (email address and name) under “*Invite a new user*” and press the button “*Invite this reviewer...*”.

After that an interface will appear showing a pre-formatted letter that will be sent by email to the person asked for the review. You can edit the email text, but are advised to do so as little as possible. In particular, be careful with the `%%INVITATION_URL%%` link: it points to the actual url of the paper in the Episciences system, which needs to be accessible to the reviewer and so that he can accept or decline the invitation.

The deadline for the review can be modified by editing the field “*Rating due date*” in the interface. Please update the deadline in the email text accordingly as this will not happen automatically.

The standard time for a report is within three months; in case more time is needed, you can decide to grant it, but please do this only exceptionally, allowing no more than one additional month.

If a referee does not react to your invitation letter within a week, send a very polite reminder. You can do so by accessing your “*unanswered rating invitation*” in the “*Reviewers*” box and clicking on the button labelled by “:” on the left of the reviewer’s name. This will open a menu with the option “*Contact this reviewer*”. Note that this menu allows you to take other actions, including granting a deadline extension and removing your review request.

A reminder will automatically be sent to both you and the reviewer two weeks after an unanswered invitation.

3. REFEREEING PROCESS

Two weeks before the allotted time both you and the reviewer will receive an automatic reminder. If the review is not submitted yet one week after the deadline, both you and the reviewer will automatically receive a reminder.

If after yet another week you do not receive a review, you should get in contact with the reviewer (by using the menu button next to the reviewer’s name). In case no answer comes after three weeks, please contact the Editor-in-chief to inform him/her that there is a problem.

Authors may upload a cover letter or comments (e.g. a response letter to referees) together with a (revised) submission. This cover letter is visible to editors (on the admin page of the paper in the “*Author’s comments / Cover letter*” box) and to referees on the page where they submit their report of a paper.

3.1 Authors wanting to replace/withdraw the submitted version while refereeing

Before any review has been received for a certain paper, the authors have the option to delete their submission, using the red button on the bottom-left corner of the Episciences interface associated with their paper. This is currently the only way to get a submission permanently deleted from the system. Beware that the reviewers will also receive a notification of this action.

After at least one review has been received, the red button is not available anymore. To withdraw a submission, it then has to be rejected by the handling editor. In this case the authors should contact the handling editor, who should then proceed with the rejection. Any new version of the paper will need to be submitted from scratch and will not share any bond with the previous submission. In particular, the editor will need to assign reviewers again.

There is also the possibility to push the button “*Abandon publication process*” in the top most box on the article page. This will stop the peer review process and notify author, editor and reviewers. The process may later be resumed by the Editor-in-Chief.

3.2 Referees wanting to change their submitted reports

For this go to the “*Reviewers*” box on the admin page of a paper, click on the button next to the referee's name and choose “*Allow to edit the reviewing*”.

3.3 Editors wanting to submit reports on behalf of referees

For this go to the “*Reviewers*” box on the admin page of a paper, click on the button next to the referee's name and choose “*Upload reviewer report*”.

4. ACCEPTANCE DECISION AND PUBLICATION

Please apply very strict criteria for the acceptance of papers. The goal of Logical Methods in Computer Science is to be a leading journal in the area. To achieve this, all accepted papers should be well written and contain novel, interesting and significant results. Routine, though solid, papers should not be accepted; from a quality scale of 1 to 10, you should accept only papers from 7 upwards.

Any decision concerning the paper has to be processed using the “*Article status*” box on the article page ([My Account](#) → [Assigned Articles](#) → article page). There you can see the current status of the submission and change it by pressen the “*Change article status*” button. There are four options to choose from:

1. “*Accept and proceed to copy editing*”,
2. “*Ask for a minor revision*”,
3. “*Ask for a major revision*”,
4. “*Reject this article*”.

(The fifth option “*Ask for other editors opinion*” is not used by Logical Methods in Computer Science and should not be chosen.)

In each case, by choosing the option you will access an email template. The email will notify the authors of your decision. It is already designed to contain all the relevant information (scores, reviews) and you can customize it with a personal message.

Decision to accept:

If you accept the paper (by pushing the “*Accept and proceed to copy editing*” button), the authors will be notified and the paper changes its status to “*Accepted*”. The layout editors who monitor this status (but are not automatically notified of each accepted submission!) then contact the authors to prepare the proof and publish the paper.

Please **only accept the final author version** of a submission. All revisions (even very minor) should be completed prior to acceptance.

Decision to ask for a minor or major revision:

With these two options the email template requires you to specify a deadline for the revision. The guidelines are to give one month for minor revisions and three months for major revisions, but you may decide on the base of the reviewers’ questions. When sending out the notification there is an option to reassign the same reviewers automatically to the revised version. This should be used with a bit of care because all the previous reviewers will receive an automatic invitation when the revised version is submitted by the authors **without the possibility of prior intervention** by the handling editor.

The previous version(s) and their reviewing process remain available in the “*History*” box. Also, the process of asking for a revision can be repeated. Papers that need heavy revisions because the submission was sloppy or incorrect should be rejected even in case you feel that improvements to the standards of Logical Methods in Computer Science are possible.

Thank you very much for your patience in reading these guidelines and for following them in your editorial work.