



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Last updated: October 1, 2024

Guidelines for Manuscript Decision

0 Introduction

The manuscript decision process at *Baishideng Publishing Group (Baishideng)* includes three steps: First review, second review, and final review.

First review involves an initial assessment of the manuscript's scientific merit, innovation, and potential academic misconduct. This review is conducted by the Journal's Editor-in-Chief/ Associate Editor or the publisher's Science Editor. If the manuscript does not meet most or all of the initial assessment criteria, it is either rejected or returned to the authors with a request to include the missing information, along with encouragement for resubmission. If the manuscript meets the basic requirements for external review, the AI Editor or Science Editor will invite external peer reviewers with domain expertise to evaluate it. After the rigorous external peer review is completed, the Science Editor and the Executive Editor-in-Chief of the publisher will make the first decision of either provisional acceptance, return to the authors for revision, recommendation of submitting to another *Baishideng* journal, or rejection.

The second review involves evaluating the revised manuscript and accompanying documents submitted by the authors. This process is first conducted by the Science Editor of the publisher and then by the Journal's Editor-in-Chief, who evaluate the scientific quality, ethical compliance, and language based on the comments and suggestions raised in the peer-review report, and culminates in the second decision of acceptance, further revision, or rejection based on the re-review reports submitted by some or all of the peer reviewers, according to their availability and/or contribution to the first review.



The final review determines whether the manuscript will be accepted, returned for additional revision, or rejected, based on the comments from the first and second reviews as outlined in the accompanying peer-review reports.

The academic integrity standards, individuals responsible for the manuscript decision, and the decision-making process for the first, second, and final reviews by the publisher are as follows:

1 Academic integrity standards

The publisher maintains strict standards of academic integrity for its Science Editors (including the Science Editor Development Department Director and the Executive Editor-in-Chief). Violations of academic integrity include but are not limited to:

- 1.1 Presenting editorial opinions contrary to academic and ethical standards.
- 1.2 Violating conflict-of-interest provisions.
- 1.3 Breaching confidentiality requirements.
- 1.4 Misappropriating manuscript content.
- 1.5 Interfering with manuscript review.
- 1.6 Seeking illegitimate benefits.
- 1.7 Engaging in other forms of academic misconduct, such as failing to uphold editorial standards when reviewing ethical documents provided by authors, neglecting to address authors' improper inclusion of self-citations, or deliberately distorting authors' original intent in manuscript revisions.

To safeguard against both intentional and unintentional bias, the manuscript review process is divided into the three stages of first review, second review, and final review. To prevent potential bias, no single Science Editor is permitted to oversee more than one stage of this process.

2 Persons responsible for manuscript decisions



The first decision is made by the Science Editor and the Science Editor Development Department Director of the publisher, the Journal's Editor-in-Chief, and the Executive Editor-in-Chief of the publisher. The second decision is made by the Science Editor and the Science Editor Development Department Director of the publisher, the Journal's Editor-in-Chief, and the Language Editor. The publisher's Executive Editor-in-Chief will make the third/final decision.

3 Key points for first decision-making

After the external peer reviewers invited by the AI Editor or Science Editor of the publisher complete their peer review, the manuscript is assigned to the Science Editor by the publisher's Science Editor Development Department Director to make the first decision. Generally, the first decision of acceptance, revision, recommendation of submitting to another *Baishideng* journal, or rejection is made based on the first peer review reports from 3 peer reviewers. In special cases the first decision can be made based on the peer-review report(s) from 1-3 peer reviewers. The key points for the first decision on the manuscript by the Science Editor of the publisher include:

- 3.1 Does the manuscript fall within the scope of the journal?
- 3.2 Is the manuscript scientific, innovative, and practical?
- 3.3 Does the manuscript contain potential academic misconduct?
- 3.4 Is the type of the manuscript categorized by the author(s) consistent with the content of the manuscript?
- 3.5 Is the manuscript invited or unsolicited (*i.e.* freely submitted)?
- 3.6 Is the invitation number of the manuscript (only for invited manuscripts) present in the manuscript information?
- 3.7 Do the ethics of the manuscript meet the publication requirements?
- 3.8 In the findings of the assessments of scientific quality, are the following key points



included? (1) Verification of the academic rating of the manuscript by the peer reviewers; (2) Summarization of the comments of the peer reviewers and outlines of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript; (3) Description of the quantity and quality of the figure(s) and table(s) in the manuscript; and (4) Statement of whether the references are cited adequately and reasonably.

3.9 Does the peer reviewers' language quality rating reach grade B or above?

3.10 In the findings of assessments of the quality of manuscript writing, are the following key points included? (1) A logically organized manuscript structure; (2) Adequate and complete figure(s) and table(s); (3) Adequate discussion of the comprehensive results; and (4) Accuracy, relevancy and currentness of the references.

3.11 In the findings of assessments of the manuscript's references, are the following key points included? (1) Proper format and citation in the text; and (2) Provision of more than 100 references if the article is a Review; provision of under 100 references if the article is a Minireview or Opinion Review; provision of more than 30 references if the article is a Case Report or Literature Review?

3.12 Is the manuscript supported by fund(s) from international or national organizations?

Based on the 12 items considered above, the Science Editor writes specific comments and suggestions to support their reasoned recommendation to accept or reject the manuscript or to submit to another *Baishideng* journal. Finally, the Executive Editor-in-Chief makes the first decision of acceptance, revision, recommendation to the authors of submission to another *Baishideng* journal, or rejection based on the peer-review reports and the comments and suggestions of the Science Editor.

4 Matrix rubric criteria for second decision-making

Manuscripts accepted in the first review and then revised by the author(s) will undergo a second review for second decision-making. The publisher's Science Editor Development



Department Director assigns the manuscript revised by the author(s) to the Science Editor for editing and processing. The critical points for the Science Editor to address in this step of processing the revised manuscript include:

- 4.1 Is the type of the manuscript categorized by the author(s) consistent with the content of the manuscript?
- 4.2 Is the manuscript invited or unsolicited (*i.e.* freely submitted)?
- 4.3 Is the invitation number of the manuscript (only for invited manuscripts) added to the manuscript information?
- 4.4 Did the author(s) revise the manuscript according to the requirements of the Science Editor in conformity with the work list?
- 4.5 Do the authors provide the ethical documents corresponding to the journal column?
- 4.6 Do the non-native English-speaking authors provide the language certificate?
- 4.7 Are all documents related to the manuscript provided and correctly uploaded to the F6Publishing system according to the manuscript type?
- 4.8 Did the authors revise the manuscript in accordance with the comments and suggestions raised in the peer-review report(s)?
- 4.9 Is the iThenticate check result qualified?
- 4.10 Is the manuscript supported by fund(s) from international or national organizations?
- 4.11 Is the corresponding author a member of an international or national society?
- 4.12 Is the first author under 45 years-old?
- 4.13 Is the corresponding author who filled in the ID number a member of the editorial boards of *Baishideng* series journals?
- 4.14 Is the corresponding author who filled in the ID number a peer reviewer of *Baishideng* series journals?

Based upon the complete 14 matrix rubric criteria considered above, the Science Editor writes the second decision summary and provides a reasoned recommendation for the



decision of acceptance or rejection to the Journal's Editor-in-Chief.

5 Matrix rubric criteria for final decision-making

After the second decision on the manuscript is made, the Science Editor Development Department Director of the publisher assigns the manuscript to the Executive Editor-in-Chief of the publisher, who will make the final decision of acceptance or rejection based on the collective comments and suggestions of the Science Editor and the decision of the Journal's Editor-in-Chief. The matrix rubric criteria for the final decision made by the Executive Editor-in-Chief of the publisher include:

5.1 Manuscript type: Is the type of manuscript categorized by the author(s) consistent with the content of the manuscript?

5.2 Manuscript source: Is the manuscript invited or unsolicited (*i.e.* freely submitted)?

5.3 Publication ethics: Are ethics, informed consent, copyright transfer agreement, and other documents appropriate and complete? Is the iThenticate check result qualified?

5.4 Scientific quality: Do the academic quality, figure and table quality, language quality, and editing quality of the final manuscript meet the publication standards?

5.5 Final decision: The manuscript is officially accepted for publication, returned for further revision, or rejected.

6 Criteria for decisions on Correction and Retraction Note manuscripts

A Correction manuscript is a formally published statement that corrects important errors, such as inaccurate or inappropriate statements or documents, as discovered by the author, reader, or editor after the article has been published. A Retraction Note manuscript is a formally published statement by the editorial office or author announcing a retraction decision made by the Editorial Board following an investigation of a published article and citing the underlying reasons, or a retraction decision made by the author of a published



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

article and citing the underlying reasons. In general, these two types of manuscripts do not need to be sent for peer review to check their scientific quality and are published after internal verification by the editorial office. If there is a special Correction manuscript that involves changes to important scientific issues related to the published article, such as results, conclusions, and images, it will be sent to peer reviewers for review.