Building Impact Through Peer Review

Peer review is at the heart of the publishing process. We believe it needs to be rigorous, fair for authors and reviewers, as well as constructive, transparent and efficient. We have introduced radical innovation in web technologies to implement our Collaborative Review.

Our Review Principles

Collaborative
Our Collaborative Review Forum unites the authors and reviewers in a direct online dialogue, enabling quick iterations and facilitating consensus. Editors and reviewers work with you to improve your paper.

Objective
The final decision is based on consensus about objective issues. We publish all papers judged unanimously to be technically sound. Unanimity is also required to reject a paper. Judgments regarding the importance of a paper can be made through open post-publication reviews and we use objective impact metrics to spotlight outstanding papers and invite them for “Focused Reviews”.

Transparent
All associate and review editors’ names are made public upon the publication of articles, acknowledging their contribution. As a result reviewers are constructive, but also responsible for the paper and provide rigorous feedback that delivers the highest possible quality publication. Conflict-of interest, if present, is openly apparent.

Rigorous
We implemented detailed review questionnaires to guide our reviewers through the review process and provide in-depth review reports.

Efficient
We offer one of the fastest reviews amongst academic publishers. Frontiers’ publishing platform is developed by our engineering team in house. Our Review Forum guides authors, reviewers and editors smoothly through the steps and alerts you when any action is required. This has shortened the average time from submission to acceptance to 84 days.

Submit Your Paper Today and Benefit From a Truly Collaborative Process

Numbers*

84 DAYS
from submission to acceptance

90% OF OUR AUTHORS
feel our Collaborative Review has helped improve their paper

90% OF OUR AUTHORS
rated our Collaborative Review Forum as good or excellent

90% OF OUR AUTHORS
prefer our Collaborative Review over traditional peer review

80% OF OUR AUTHORS
were happy with the level of support received by Frontiers staff during the publishing process

85% OF OUR REVIEWERS
think the review questionnaires helped them focus on the most important aspects of the paper

*data as of October 2014