

## Summary of NAFE Journal Peer Review Process – updated 3/7/2019

1. Potential authors submit abstracts (approximately 100 to 150 words) for consideration to the Journal Editor (**JE**) at least 60 days prior to a conference.
2. The Technical Editor (**TechE**) (also known as the Technical Review Committee Chair) reviews abstracts, suggests modifications, and approves or rejects abstracts based on technical merit and appropriateness for publication in the Journal. A check is made to ensure no topics conflict with other recent or planned presentations / papers. If the abstract is approved, authors are given instructions by the **JE** for content requirements, publication details, deadlines, and reference documents. Authors must confirm their thorough review of these instructions.
3. Authors must complete a draft manuscript (90% complete), due 30 days prior to a conference. An Associate Technical Editor (**ATE**) will review the 90% drafts for clarity, completeness, and for any obvious technical content issues. Presentations take place at winter and summer conferences; authors must provide their presentation slides for **ATE** review 15 days prior to the conference. The **ATE** may require presentation changes. Disputes between authors and the **ATE** will be settled by the **TechE**. Authors may not present unless the draft manuscript and slides are provided in advance and all disputes are resolved by the Wednesday preceding the conference.
4. Authors submit final manuscripts (with any post-presentation changes) and final presentation slideshows to the **JE** 30 days after the conference. Slideshows are retained to support possible audits by state licensure boards regarding continuing education.
5. Prior to peer review, the **JE** reviews the manuscript for obvious formatting or organizational issues, and checks to see if the manuscript meets NAFE Journal requirements. Significant issues may require author resolution prior to peer review. The NAFE Journal Editorial staff cannot guide significant rewriting of manuscripts. Authors may wish to obtain professional guidance on technical paper creation in advance, regarding editing, graphics creation, and citation/reference formatting.
6. An **ATE** is assigned by the **TechE** for each paper. The **ATE** then solicits at least two peer reviewers (**PR**) (based on their areas of expertise) for each manuscript. It may take some time to locate two **PR**s with the necessary expertise – which can cause delays in the review process. Authors may request that certain persons *not* review their manuscript. The peer review is “blind” (authors are unaware of **PR** identity); this is the most common type of peer review for scholarly journals.
7. The **JE** sends manuscripts out for blind peer review with specific instructions to offer constructive feedback. The **PR**'s goals are to:
  - a) Objectively determine whether the manuscript describes methodologies and concepts clearly.
  - b) Objectively determine whether those methodologies and concepts are technically sound.
  - c) Objectively determine whether the final conclusions reached by the author(s), based on those methodologies and concepts, are reasonable.

continued...

8. The peer-reviewed manuscript is then reviewed/edited by the assigned **ATE**, who looks for redundancy, under-explained concepts, unsupported inferences, superfluous content, and poor flow of content. Following this, **PR & ATE** comments and edits will be forwarded to the author directly. If the comments/edits significantly question the author's methodologies or conclusions, the manuscript may be forwarded to the **TechE** for additional review. In this situation, the **PR, ATE, and TechE** comments/edits will be sent to the author by the **JE**.
9. Authors revise their drafts based on the reviews & edits and send back to **JE**. All comments must be addressed by the author, though not necessarily acted upon in the manner requested by the **PR** and **ATE**. If an author believes any comments are unfounded, they can so indicate in their revised version sent back to the **JE**. If the reviewers/editors had significant concerns with the draft, the revised manuscript will likely be returned to them to determine if the concerns were addressed. The assigned **ATE** will mediate between the author and **PR** while attempting to resolve differing opinions. The peer review process often takes several iterations. Following the resolution of the **PR & ATE** edits, the manuscript goes to the **TechE** for final review – and then back to the author if necessary. If a manuscript is rejected by either **PR**, the **ATEs** and **TechE** will decide on whether the rejection is well founded or what would need to be done to remediate the paper. The author will typically be allowed to resubmit a rejected paper at a later date following any necessary revisions.
10. If the author, **PRs, ATE, and TechE** have agreed on revisions, the **JE** does the publication layout and sends it to authors for accuracy check and approval. Following final edits to the layout, the author receives an electronic copy for their own use, and the paper is published.

*Note: There is no guarantee that all papers will be published. The **TechE** and **JE** reserve the right to not publish a paper (or put it on hold for author rework) if it does not meet the criteria for publication due to any number of issues, including, but not limited to, situations where technical or presentation issues still exist despite repeated review cycles/revisions or when authors, **PRs, ATE** and the **TechE** cannot agree on the quality or technical validity of a final version. Please keep in mind that the **PRs, ATEs** and **TechE** are volunteers with other commitments, and their time must be respected.*