



Editorial procedure

- Uploading
- Decision before review
- Decision after review
- Correcting the proof
- Topical issues

Uploading a Manuscript

The submission of a manuscript via the Editorial Manager system (<http://acqual.edmgr.com>) confirms the intention of the author(s) to have it published in ACQUAL. The system guides the author through various steps and requests information. Suggesting reviewers does not oblige the editor to consult these, however in any case helps to find appropriately specialized reviewers without unnecessary delay.

Uploading a file larger than 10 MB is subject to prior arrangement; please contact the editor.

The final step of the upload procedure is the conversion of the Word file into a PDF file: *authors are reminded to approve the final version*, lest the submission is considered incomplete and the editorial process is withheld.

After the approval of the PDF version the particular submission channel of the Editorial Manager is disabled for further input until the authors are being informed on the editors' decision. The editorial process with the reviewing is performed using the PDF version exclusively, so that all parties concerned are sure to deal with the same version. This implies that the authors are responsible to adjust their manuscript for compliance with the rules and **Compulsory Conventions**.

Decision Before Review

If the topic of the manuscript is clearly out of scope, it will be rejected without being sent to reviewers.

If the language or presentation level is too low or if basic rules of scientific style are largely ignored, authors will be asked to improve and re-submit the manuscript (under the same article number). The editors reserve the right to reject a submitted manuscript in such a case.

Decision After Review

When the comments received from the reviewers enable the editors to cast a decision, the author will be informed on the result along with the "comments to the author" provided by the reviewers. Decisions and how they are to be understood:

- "accepted" the manuscript will be sent into production as is, corrections are possible only in the proof copy (if at all - see topic 'proof reading' in the section "**After Acceptance**"); otherwise a separate "Erratum" is possible
- "minor revision" the authors are asked for primarily formal corrections or re-wording before the manuscript can be accepted

"revision"	the editors came to the conclusion that scientific issues should be re-considered or that the extent of necessary adjustments and corrections is considerable
"major revision"	unacceptable in present form; to avoid rejection, authors are advised that thorough re-thinking, re-organization, or re-cast - rather than 'cosmetic' repairs - will be necessary in essential parts of the manuscript
"rejected"	terminates the submission process in the Editorial Manager; renewed submission of a rejected manuscript will not be considered unless the reasons for rejection have been removed satisfyingly.

Authors can withdraw their submission from the Editorial Manager following any decision for revision.

If a manuscript under revision is not re-submitted within 6 months or information on intended re-submission is not obtained, the submission may be terminated by formal rejection.

Asking the author for any revision, re-opens the Editorial Manager so that the authors can upload a revised version. This re-submission must be accompanied by an itemized response to the reviewers' comments which often are of significance for a balanced valuing of the views of authors and reviewers.

When it comes to the final decision (accepted or rejected), reviewers having given a deviating recommendation will be informed. A response and a protest or appeal of the authors against rejecting their submission is forwarded to the reviewers for information.

Correcting the Proof

The corresponding author and the managing editor receive copies of the proof at the same time. The editor checks primarily for details of the formal implementation of the manuscript into the format to be published. Please note the entry "Proof Reading" of the section **After Acceptance**.

Topical Issues

The journal publishes Topical Issues dedicated to important developments in science and practice. Usually a specialist of the particular field serves as Guest Editor who guides the manuscript acquisition, nominates competent reviewers, and is involved in the decision making process. Suggestions for Topical Issues should be sent to the Managing Editor.

Similarly, the journal cooperates with conferences where high-level contributions are to be expected, by inviting speakers and poster authors to submit manuscripts based on their presentations. A note on the front page of each article gives credit to the event, where the presentation was given.

Please note: ACQUAL does not publish proceedings of the traditional type intending to reflect the panorama of the event but strives solely for high-quality contributions. falling within the journal's **Scope**. Customary Peer Reviewing as outlined in section **Article Types** applies to all contributions submitted for a Topical Issue and concerns scientific level and novelty as well as formal presentation.

Accreditation and Quality Assurance
Journal for Quality, Comparability and Reliability in
Chemical Measurement

Editor-in-Chief: Fajgelj, A.; van der Veen, A.M.H.

ISSN: 0949-1775 (print version)

ISSN: 1432-0517 (electronic version)

Journal no. 769