

ACNR Peer Review Policy

General information

ACNR's clinical review articles are peer-reviewed. Other contributed articles, conference reports, and book reviews are not usually peer-reviewed. However, these may be peer-reviewed at the discretion of the editors.

For any questions that are not addressed here, please contact the Publisher, Rachael Hansford, Rachael@acnr.co.uk

Criteria for publication

The major content of ACNR is short reviews commissioned independently from leading UK and international experts. There is a focus on emerging knowledge about clinical neuroscience, neurology, rehabilitation and therapeutics, as well as evidence-based analysis of neurological practice – often in areas where definitive evidence and consensus is lacking. ACNR prioritises review articles, but will consider original research articles where appropriate.

Manuscript review process

Articles are submitted to ACNR via email to Anna@acnr.co.uk or Rachael@acnr.co.uk

The Editorial co-ordinator checks the article against our Author Guidelines to ensure it includes the required information.

The Editors check that the paper is appropriate for ACNR and sufficiently original/interesting. Only those articles deemed most likely to be appropriate for ACNR are sent for formal review. Articles deemed inappropriate are rejected without peer review as soon as possible.

Selecting peer-reviewers

The choice of peer reviewer is based on many factors, with priority given to those within the specialty area, as well as reputation, recommendation and the editor's experience.

Authors are welcome to suggest suitable independent reviewers and may also request exclusions. The editors' decision on the choice of referees is final.

The editorial co-ordinator sends invitations to the recommended reviewers. As responses are received, further invitations are issued if necessary, until a suitable peer reviewer is agreed.

Once we have agreement from at least one peer reviewer, they are sent the article and a peer review form to complete.

ACNR aims for rapid editorial decisions and publication. We therefore ask reviewers to respond within two weeks.

Anonymity

ACNR's reviewers are anonymous, unless they choose to reveal their identity. However, we ask reviewers not to identify themselves to authors while an article is being considered.

Writing the review

The review should be completed on the supplied form and submitted to ACNR's editorial co-ordinator, Anna@acnr.co.uk

The main purpose of the review is to provide the editors with the information needed to reach a decision. However, the review should also instruct the authors on how they can improve their paper to make it acceptable, if appropriate. Confidential comments to the editor are welcome.

The form focuses on the following questions:

- Is the article appropriate for ACNR and up to date?
- Does it have adequate illustrations?
- Does it have appropriate references, correctly presented?
- Is the abstract clear?
- Referees comments to the Editors: for example, does the reviewer feel that the article is of immediate interest to many people in their own discipline, and/or allied healthcare professionals?
- Referees comments to the author: for example, suggested improvements.

The reviewer can choose between 4 recommendations:

- Accept, with or without editorial revisions
- Invite the authors to revise their manuscript to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached
- Reject, but indicate to the authors if further work might justify a resubmission
- Reject, for example on grounds of lack of novelty.

If a reviewer recommends significant revisions and the author addresses these in a revised article, we will return it to the reviewer for their approval. However, where only minor changes are requested, the follow-up review may be done by the Editors.

Final decision

Reviewers are invited to recommend a particular course of action, but should be aware that other reviewers may have different expertise/views. If the reviews differ widely, the editor may invite an additional reviewer in order to get an extra opinion before making a decision.

The editors will make the final decision after taking all views into account.

The Editorial Co-ordinator will send the decision to the author(s), including anonymised reviewer comments.

Next Steps

If the article is rejected or sent back for revision, the Editorial Co-ordinator will include constructive comments from the reviewers to help the author improve the article.

If accepted, the paper is sent to production for the next paper copy. We aim to publish online as soon as possible.