

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

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.

We offer one of the fastest reviews

SUBMIT YOUR PAPER
TODAY AND BENEFIT
FROM A TRULY
COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

NUMBERS*

*data as of October 2014

84	DAYS
90%	OF OUR AUTHORS
90%	OF OUR AUTHORS
90%	OF OUR AUTHORS
80%	OF OUR AUTHORS
85%	OF OUR REVIEWERS

from submission to acceptance

feel our Collaborative Review has **helped improve their paper**

rated our Collaborative Review Forum as good or excellent

prefer our Collaborative Review
over traditional peer review

were **happy with the level of support** received by Frontiers staff
during the publishing process

think the review questionnaires helped them focus on the most important aspects of the paper