The MDPI Editorial Process

MDPI operates a rigorous peer-review process. In most cases, this is a single-blind assessment with at least two independent reviewers, followed by a final acceptance/rejection decision by the Editor-in-Chief, or another academic editor approved by the Editor-in-Chief.

A summary of the editorial process is given in the flow charts below. The following provides notes on each step.

**Pre-check**
Immediately after submission, this check is initially carried out by the managing editor to assess:
- Suitability of the manuscript to the journal/section/Special Issue
- Qualification and background of authors
- Reject obviously poor manuscripts

An appropriate Academic Editor will be notified of the submission and invited to check and recommend reviewers, the Editor-in-Chief in the case of regular submissions, the Guest Editor in the case of Special Issue submissions, or an Editorial Board Member in the case of a conflict of interest.

**Peer-review**
At least two review reports are collected for each submitted article. Suggestions of reviewers can be made by the Academic Editor during pre-check. In the majority of cases, MDPI editorial staff will use qualified Editorial Board Members, qualified reviewers from our database, or new reviewers identified by web searches for related articles.

All journals operate optional open peer review, meaning that authors can choose for the review reports to be published with their paper and reviewers can choose to include their name if their report is published. The process is single blind for most journals, meaning the author does not know the identity of the reviewer, but the reviewer knows the identity of the author. Some journals operate a double-blind peer review process.
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The following checks are applied to all reviewers:

• They have no conflicts of interest with the authors, including if they have published together in the last five years.
• They hold a PhD (exceptions are made in some fields, e.g., medicine).
• They must have recent publications in the field of the submitted paper.
• They have not recently been invited to review a manuscript for any MDPI journal.

To assist academic editors, MDPI staff handle all communication with reviewers, authors, and the external editor. However, Academic Editors can check the status of manuscripts and the identity of reviewers at any time. Reviewers are given up to two weeks to write their review. For the review of a revised manuscript, reviewers are asked to provide their report within three days. In both cases, extensions can be granted on request.

A paper can be accepted for publication by an Editorial Board Member or Guest Editor, not MDPI employees.

Editor Decision

When making an editorial decision, we expect that the academic editor checks the following:

• The suitability of selected reviewers;
• Adequacy of reviewer comments and author response;
• Overall scientific quality of the paper;
• The editor can select from: accept, reject, ask author for revision, ask for an additional reviewer.

If there is suspicion that a paper contains plagiarism, the editorial office will check using the industry standard iThenticate software.

Revision

In cases where minor revisions are recommended, the author is usually requested to revise the paper before referring to the external editor. Articles may or may not be sent to reviewers after author revision, dependent on whether the reviewer requested to see the revised version and the wishes of the Academic editor. Apart from in exceptional circumstances, we allow a maximum of two rounds of major revision per manuscript.

Production

MDPI carries our production on all manuscripts, including language editing, copy editing and conversion to XML. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the academic quality of the publication process. This includes making final decisions on manuscripts or approving scholars to whom the decision can be delegated. The Editor-in-Chief also approves new Editorial Board Members.

Publication Ethics

MDPI is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) [publicationethics.org] and follows its procedures for dealing with potentially unethical behaviour by authors, reviewers, or editors.