**Peer review policy (Springer)**

Peer review exists to ensure that journals publish good science which is of benefit to entire scientific community.

Sometimes authors find the peer-review process intimidating because it can lead to the rejection of their manuscript. Keep in mind that revisions and improvement are part of the publication process and actually help raise the quality of your manuscript.

Peer review is a positive process

Peer review is an integral part of scientific publishing that confirms the validity of the science reported. Peer reviewers are experts who volunteer their time to help improve the journal manuscripts they review—they offer authors **free advice**.

Through the peer-review process, manuscripts should become:

* More **robust**: Peer reviewers may point out gaps in your paper that require more explanation or additional experiments.
* Easier to **read**: If parts of your paper are difficult to understand, reviewers can tell you so that you can fix them. After all, if an expert cannot understand what you have done, it is unlikely that a reader in a different field will understand.
* More **useful**: Peer reviewers also consider the importance of your paper to others in your field and can make suggestions to improve or better highlight this to readers.

Of course, in addition to offering authors advice, another important purpose of peer review is to make sure that the manuscripts published in the journal are of the correct quality for the journal’s aims.

Different types of peer review

There are different forms of peer review used by journals, although the basis is always the same, field experts providing comments on a paper to help improve it. The most common types are

Closed – where the reviewers are aware of the authors’ identities but the authors do not know who reviewed their manuscript.

Double blind – in this case neither authors nor reviewers know each other’s identities.

Open – where there reviewers are aware of the authors’ identity and the reviewers’ identity is revealed to the authors. In some cases journals also publish the reviewers’ reports alongside the final published manuscript.

**Peer review policy (elsevier)**

The practice of peer review is to ensure that only good science is published. It is an objective process at the heart of good scholarly publishing and is carried out by all reputable scientific journals. Our referees play a vital role in maintaining the high standards Transport Policy and all manuscripts are peer reviewed following the procedure outlined below.

**Initial manuscript evaluation** The Editor first evaluates all manuscripts. It is rare, but it is possible for an exceptional manuscript to be accepted at this stage. Manuscripts rejected at this stage are insufficiently original, have serious scientific flaws, have poor grammar or English language, or are outside the aims and scope of the journal. Those that meet the minimum criteria are normally passed on to at least 2 experts for review.   
  
**Type of Peer Review**Transport Policy employs double blind reviewing, where both the referee and author remain anonymous throughout the process.   
  
**How the referee is selected** Whenever possible, referees are matched to the paper according to their expertise and our database is constantly being updated.   
  
**Referee reports** Referees are asked to evaluate whether the manuscript: - Is original - Is methodologically sound - Follows appropriate ethical guidelines - Has results which are clearly presented and support the conclusions - Correctly references previous relevant work.  
  
Language correction is not part of the peer review process, but referees may, if so wish, suggest corrections to the manuscript.   
  
**How long does the review process take?** The time required for the review process is dependent on the response of the referees. Should the referee’s reports contradict one another or a report is unnecessarily delayed, a further expert opinion will be sought. In rare cases for which it is extremely difficult to find a second referee to review the manuscript, or when the one referee’s report has thoroughly convinced the Editor, decisions at this stage to accept, reject or ask the author for a revision are made on the basis of only one referee’s report. The Editor’s decision will be sent to the author with recommendations made by the referees, which usually includes verbatim comments by the referees. Revised manuscripts might be returned to the initial referees who may then request another revision of a manuscript.   
  
**Final report**A final decision to accept or reject the manuscript will be sent to the author along with any recommendations made by the referees, and may include verbatim comments by the referees.   
  
**Editor’s Decision is final** Referees advise the editor, who is responsible for the final decision to accept or reject the article.

**Becoming a referee for Transport Policy** If you are not currently a referee for Transport Policy but would like to be considered as a referee, please contact the editor. The benefits of refereeing for Transport Policy include the opportunity to read see and evaluate the latest work in your research area at an early stage, and to contribute to the overall integrity of scientific research and its published documentation. You may also be able to cite your work for Transport Policy as part of your professional development requirements for various Professional Societies and Organisations.