

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 event 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 "Instructions for Authors" 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 but you don't want to handle the paper, then you should 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, the submission may be rejected immediately.

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" tab. 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 new reviewer, a window opens where you should first choose whether that person is a 'Known reviewer', a 'New reviewer' who has already an account (there is an input line to search through existing accounts) or a 'New reviewer' who does not have an account. In the last case you should provide an email address of the reviewer and then hit 'Next'.

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 [%%URL%%](#) string: it points to the actual url of the paper in the Episciences system, which needs to be accessible to the reviewer.

The deadline for the review can be modified by editing the field “Rating due date” in the interface. Check that the deadline in the email text is updated accordingly.

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 cogwheel icon next to 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, try to get in contact with the reviewer (by using the menu in the cogwheel icon 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 'Cover letter / author's comments' 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 and the only way to withdraw a submission is to have it rejected. 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.

3.2 Referees wanting to change their submitted reports

This feature is available since March 2018. For this go to the 'Reviewers' box on the admin page of a paper, click on the cogwheel next the the referee's name and choose 'Allow to edit the reviewing'.

3.3 Editors wanting to submit reports on behalf of referees

This feature is available since March 2018. For this go to the 'Reviewers' box on the admin page of a paper, click on the cogwheel next the the referee's name and choose 'Review on behalf of this reviewer account'.

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 last box in the article interface (My Account -> Assigned Articles -> article page), called "Article status". There you can see the current status of the submission and change it. There are four options: accept, ask for minor revision, ask for major revision, and reject.

In each case, by pushing the associated button 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 customise it with a personal message.

Decision to accept:

If you accept the paper (by pushing the "Accept this article" button), Episciences will automatically send the paper to the layout editor who will take care of the style modifications needed. The layout editor then contacts the authors for a last-minute OK before publication. Please note that acceptance means that the authors cannot make any further (even minor) revision. The accepted version is the final version of the paper.

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. The previous version(s) and their reviewing process remain available in the "History" tab. 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.