Welcome to the Frontiers community of Editors.
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1. **FRONTIERS EDITORIAL BOARDS**

Editorial boards comprise 4 distinct roles, whose responsibilities are divided as follows:

1. The **Field Chief Editor** oversees the entire journal and acts in collaboration with the Editorial Office to assist and guide the Specialty Chief Editors.

2. The **Specialty Chief Editors** oversee the individual journal specialties. They also build a board of 15-20 Associate Editors for their own specialty.

3. The **Associate Editors** act as handling Editors for submitted manuscripts, accepting them for publication following peer review, or recommending rejection to the Specialty Chief Editor. Associate Editors also invite Review Editors to the editorial board and can invite external reviewers for peer review.

4. The **Review Editors** act as reviewers for submitted manuscripts, engaging with the authors, Associate Editor and each other in an interactive review forum.

To learn more about the different roles on the editorial board, please click [here](#).

**N.B.:** The following guidelines mention both “Review Editors” and “reviewers”. While the former specifically refers to Review Editors on the editorial board, the latter encompasses both Review Editors and external reviewers invited by the Associate Editors to review specific manuscripts.

2. **YOUR ROLE AS REVIEW EDITOR**

2.1 **COMPLETE YOUR FRONTIERS PROFILE ON LOOP**

To join the editorial board, you created an account on our research network, **Loop**, which will allow you to receive invitations and access your review assignments. We ask that you complete your profile within two weeks by adding a photo, a brief bio, and a list of your publications.

Your publications will be important to ensure that you receive the most appropriate review invitations. To add publications to your Loop profile, visit the relevant tab (1) and insert your ORCID (2) or go through the suggested list and confirm/reject (3) records, as needed. Note that you may also update your author name(s) by selecting the corresponding option in the right-hand side menu (4).
2.2 YOUR ROLE IN PEER REVIEW

The primary role of Review Editors is to act as reviewers in the peer review of submitted manuscripts. Although this is not compulsory, you are also encouraged to be an active member of the editorial board and contribute to the success of the specialty by:

- Submitting your own manuscripts on a regular basis;
- Promoting Frontiers to your peers and colleagues.

Along with Associate Editors, Review Editors (including yourself) are the key persons of the Frontiers review process, since they are responsible for certifying the validity and accuracy of publications, and for helping authors to improve the quality of their manuscripts as well as the way in which the research is communicated. In recognition of their contribution during the peer-review process, Review Editors who have endorsed a manuscript are always acknowledged publicly, with their names and affiliations, on the published article. In contrast, Review Editors who do not endorse a manuscript remain anonymous.
3. THE FRONTIERS REVIEW PROCESS

The Frontiers collaborative review process has been designed to validate high quality scholarly contributions by fostering objectivity, rigor, and iterative collaboration. Associate Editors and reviewers are acknowledged publicly on all published articles.

3.1 SUBMISSION AND INITIAL EVALUATION

Submitted manuscripts are subjected to an initial assessment by the handling Associate Editor, who may either decide to send the manuscript out for review or recommend it for immediate rejection to the Specialty Chief Editor. Manuscripts may only be rejected without peer review for the following reasons:

- An objective error (i.e. an error that is generally recognized by the community);
- Language errors that render the research incomprehensible;
- Substantially below standard research quality;
- Lack of appropriate ethical considerations and/or non-compliance with ethical standards.

Should the manuscript be suitable for review, the handling Associate Editor will be asked to secure reviewers (minimum of 2 for the full-length article types, but they may of course assign more), either selected from the editorial board or invited externally among experts in the field. If reviewers have not been assigned within 7 days, invitations will be sent to the most relevant Review Editors from the editorial board).

3.2 THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PHASE

Upon accepting a review invitation, you will have 15 days to submit an independent review report via the online review forum. The review report is structured into a questionnaire, which varies based on the article type, to guide you through your assessment. Your review assignments and pending tasks are displayed in the MyFrontiers dashboard accessible from the top navigation bar once you log in.

The image below shows the review forum. On the right-hand side, you will find options to:

- Download the latest version of the manuscript (1);
- Access all related files (2);
- Withdraw from the process, should you not have time to continue the review, should there be a conflict of interest, or if you find any objective error in the manuscript and would like to recommend it for rejection to the handling Editor (3).
Once a review invitation has been accepted, please complete the independent review report as soon as possible, and no later than 15 days after accepting the assignment. Your constructive comments will provide authors with valuable feedback in order to improve their manuscript.

To submit your independent review report, visit the review forum and fill out the relevant boxes (see screenshot below). You may select the “Save and Resume Later” option (1) at any stage, should you still be drafting. Once the review report is ready, simply press “Submit My Report” at the top (2), so that your comments may be sent to the handling Associate Editor. If needed, you can still make changes to your report after it has been submitted, up until the interactive review forum is activated by the handling Associate Editor.
During the independent review phase, you assess the manuscript independently from other reviewers and from the authors. The Associate Editor is automatically notified as soon as your independent review report is submitted.

Once reviewers have submitted their reports, the Associate Editor is responsible for activating the next phase of the review, i.e. the interactive review forum. The handling Editor can recommend rejection based on the reviewer reports received, which will provide authors access to the comments as well as 7 days to respond. In this case reviewers are inactivated.

3.3 THE INTERACTIVE REVIEW PHASE

Once the interactive review forum is activated, authors are immediately notified to enter the review forum, where they are able to view the review comments, and have up to 35 days to prepare responses and/or a revised manuscript, if necessary.

You will be notified by email as soon as the authors have responded to your comments and will be asked to visit the review forum within 8 days to:

- Endorse publication of the manuscript, should you have no further comments (1);
- Continue your discussion with the authors, should there be pending issues (2);
• Withdraw your participation from the process or recommend the manuscript for rejection, should the authors be unable or unwilling to address your comments or should you become unavailable.

You can interact with the authors and other reviewer(s) through real-time comments in the discussion forum. The handling Associate Editor monitors the discussions to ensure the timeliness and constructiveness of the review. Issues such as problematic authors or lengthening disputes over manuscript content should be reported to the handling Associate Editor, either through the review forum or by selecting the blue envelope sign next to their name (see screenshot below).
Should a dispute arise, the Editor will act as a mediator, working with all parties involved to resolve the issue. The review is complete once all issues/comments are addressed to the reviewers’ satisfaction.

3.4 MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION

Should you recommend rejection of a manuscript, you will remain anonymous and your recommendation will be sent to the handling Editor, who will be able to either forward this recommendation to the Specialty Chief Editor, or to assign a new reviewer. Your report and any additional comments you may have posted in the forum will remain available.

When withdrawing/recommending rejection, you will be asked to select the reason for your decision from a list (see screenshot below). While this is not mandatory, you are also encouraged to provide the handling Editor with further comments. The reasons given will be visible to the Associate Editor, Chief Editors, and Editorial Office, but will not be available to the authors.
Alternatively, you may endorse a manuscript for publication, thereby indicating that your comments have been adequately addressed by the authors. When finalizing your review, you will be asked to confirm that you agree to your name being disclosed on the article, if published, and will be able to provide the authors with any final comments you may have.

The handling Associate Editor will be notified of your endorsement and is able to accept the manuscript at the end of the process, if appropriate. Manuscripts may only be accepted for publication once the required number of reviewers have endorsed publication, should no further reviews be pending. Accepted manuscripts undergo a final technical check by the Editorial Office prior to typesetting.

### 3.5 YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A REVIEWER

The mandate for reviewers is to ensure that experiments and studies were conducted correctly, taking into account appropriate ethical considerations, and that the conclusions are based on a valid, logical interpretation of the results. The wider significance of manuscripts is evaluated post-publication and demonstrated through our article-level metrics.
Reviewers are obliged to keep all manuscript files confidential and to delete all records after completing the review process. The review reports are also confidential and may only be shared with the authors and the handling Editor of the manuscript in the review forum. Posting of the review report publicly is prohibited.

Inappropriate language and unconstructive behavior will not be tolerated in the review forum and may result in a reviewer being revoked from the assignment and, in more serious cases, from the editorial board. Please also ensure a timely review by completing your assignment as soon as possible and by notifying the handling Editor and Editorial Office of any expected delays immediately.

Please see additional guidelines for reviewers issued by the Committee on Publication Ethics, that detail further ethical obligations of reviewers, here.

3.6 REQUESTING AN EXTENSION

While the Frontiers platform has been designed to ensure a thorough yet rapid review process, to enable a true discussion between authors and reviewers, you may request extensions at any stage, should you need more time to complete a review.

- During the independent review phase, extensions may be requested by sending an email to the Editorial Office, who will be able to update the system accordingly;
- During the interactive review phase, extensions may be requested by contacting the Editorial Office or by selecting the corresponding option in the right-hand side menu of the review forum, once it becomes available. Requests for long extensions will have to be confirmed by the handling Editor as well.

3.7 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

When accepting a review invitation, you are requested to confirm that you do not have any conflicts of interest (see details below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>1. Are any of the authors a spouse or significant other, a member of the same family or a very close personal friend? Review Editors should also not be a member of the same family as the handling editor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATIONS</td>
<td>2. Are you currently hosting or have hosted a Frontiers Research Topic with any of the authors within the past 2 years? Are you currently hosting a Frontiers Research Topic with the Editor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Are you currently collaborating or have you collaborated on a research project or a publication with any of the authors within the past 2 years?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Are you currently collaborating or have you collaborated with any of the authors as an advisor or in any other direct supervisory capacity in the past five years?

5. Are you currently collaborating or have you collaborated with any of the authors as a student or in any other direct subordinate capacity in the past five years?

Note: Review Editors should not accept assignments if they have a close professional relationship with the handling editor, which in their view could affect the objectivity of the review.

6. Are you affiliated with the same institution as the editor? Are you affiliated with the same institution as any of the authors? If so, has this resulted in interactions, collaborations, or mutual interests with the authors that would compromise your impartiality in conducting this review?

7. Are you a current member of a committee or department that coincides with an affiliation with the editor or any of the authors?

FINANCIAL

8. Do you have a business or professional partnership with any author?

9. Do you have financial interests or business relations with any organization involved in this research or in the preparation of the manuscript?

10. Do you have any financial interest in the content of the manuscript that might affect your ability to perform an objective review?

Actual or potential conflicts of interest must be reported both to the journal's Editorial Office and to the handling Editor of the manuscript.

In case of doubt, please contact the Frontiers Editorial Office at editorial.office@frontiersin.org.
4. **CONSIDER ORGANIZING A RESEARCH TOPIC**

*Frontiers Research Topics* are collections of ideally at least 10 articles on a focused research area. They create an online dialogue between many research groups about their latest advances, methods, ideas, and more. They are a great opportunity to highlight your research focus, intensify collaboration, and drive the next developments in your field.

The organization of Research Topics resembles the format of a conference, with researcher-proposed topics and abstract submissions for proposed contributions. They result in an encyclopedic collection of peer-reviewed articles available to everyone both online and as a free, downloadable e-book (see here for an example).

We recommend that Research Topics be hosted by a minimum of two Topic Editors with previous editing experience, who may be assisted by an Associate Editor from the editorial board if deemed appropriate by the Specialty Chief Editor. Topic Editors are responsible for soliciting contributions from their peers (although submissions are open to all), for selecting contributions based on abstract submissions, as well as for overseeing the review process of submitted manuscripts by acting as the handling Editors.

Feel free to contact us with any ideas you have for potential Research Topics, including those that could be hosted by other experts in the field. Research Topic proposals will need to be approved by the Specialty Chief Editor of the relevant specialty.