

PEER REVIEW POLICY

Last updated: May 16, 2024

Before submission, authors may request a preliminary scope assessment by emailing the Editor-in-Chief at editor@precisionnanomedicine.com with the title, list of authors, and summary of their manuscript. This is only an option to speed up the process. Only the appropriateness of scope will be determined in this step.

"Corresponding Author" is the person with whom the journal keeps contact. All co-authors must agree to publication and give the corresponding author the authority to correspond with the journal office on their behalf in all matters pertaining to the publication. The corresponding author is responsible for informing the co-authors about the manuscript status throughout the submission, review, and production process. There can be only one corresponding author.

Conversational LLM programs (ChatGPT, Copilot, Midjourney, BLOOM, Gemini, etc.) are allowed as tools, but those texts must be clearly marked as such. The lead author is personally responsible for checking the generated content for potential mistakes.

In the final publication, PRNANO may acknowledge authors marked as "Equally contributed to this work" or "Senior Authorship." Program creators cannot be named as authors.

Submissions

For the first submission, either MS Word or PDF files are accepted in any commonly used structure and format containing all information necessary to evaluate the manuscript, including supplementary information. *For subsequent submissions, please* follow the section names in this guide. Authors are free to apply any sub-structure they see fit.

Anybody may submit a manuscript to PRNANO, including Associate Editors and Board members, as one of the goals of this non-profit journal is to support CLINAM members and members of national nanomedicine societies. However, to avoid potential conflicts of interest, all manuscripts submitted by Board members will be handled by the Editor-in-Chief, who removes Associate Editors' access to their own manuscripts. Being a member of the Editorial Board does not constitute a conflict of interest, but it should be disclosed at the article level.

Submission of a manuscript implies that the manuscript (or one with substantially the same content by any authors) has not been previously published in any language anywhere and that it is not under simultaneous consideration by any other journal.

All manuscripts are handled online through the journal manuscript submission system. (<https://precisionnanomedicine.com/for-authors>). They may also be submitted by emailing directly to the Editor-in-Chief, although in this case, authors will not have access to their manuscripts uploaded by the EiC.

Editorial process

Perspectives, Opinions, Comments, and Letters are reviewed by the Editor-in-Chief (EiC) and at least one independent reviewer, preferably a Board Member. Case studies are reviewed by the EiC, an expert board member, and/or invited peers, if necessary.

Research Articles and Reviews are reviewed according to the workflow detailed below: (Description of workflow is also described in a post: <https://precisionnanomedicine.com/post/2346>).

Decision categories

The result of the peer review is communicated to the Authors through the submission system. The journal uses the following decisions: "**Accept**," "**Revise and Resubmit**," and "**Reject**."

"Accept" is self-explanatory.

"Revise and resubmit" indicates that the manuscript may be considered for publication, but it must be improved first (In general, no new experiments are necessary). Authors have the right to question and discuss decisions and reviewer comments in a separate letter. They neither must agree with every suggestion the reviewers have made nor accept all of those but must respond to every comment and improve their manuscript accordingly. Revised manuscripts should be returned as soon as possible to speed up processing.

All revised manuscripts must be resubmitted within three months. After *three months*, they will be considered new submissions and may be assigned to different Associate Editors and reviewers.

Within the "Reject" category, the decision may be "Desk Reject," "Reject with Hope," or "Reject." **Editors must always justify and explain why a manuscript is rejected.**

A manuscript with low scientific merit, incomprehensible language, lack of novelty (except for Replication Studies), or lack of significance may earn a **DESK REJECT** decision, and they may not be assigned to other editors or sent to reviewers.

Manuscripts that are promising but incomplete or require additional experimental work will earn a **Reject with Hope** decision. These manuscripts may be reconsidered when they are up to journal standards. Authors must address all improvements in their cover letter. When resubmitted, manuscripts with "Reject with Hope" decisions will be reassigned to the same Editor for handling, but there are no time limits for resubmission.

Peer-reviewed manuscripts with a full **Reject** decision cannot be resubmitted to PRNANO and should be sent elsewhere.

Decision process

First, the Editor-in-Chief determines whether the manuscript is within the journal's scope and provides feedback to the authors with the assigned internal ID of reference. Manuscripts outside the journal's scope will be returned to the corresponding author with a brief justification.

For the first submission, any format and file type (doc, pdf) are acceptable if it contains all information, including supporting material (if any).

Basic requirements

- The manuscript is INTERDISCIPLINARY in nature and overlaps nanotechnology with biology, pharmacology, and/or medicine.
- The work ADVANCES THE FIELD OF MEDICINE AND IMPROVES SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.
- Ethical Requirements: The manuscript follows national and international ethical standards guidelines, including studies with human and/or animal subjects (where applicable).
- Synthesis of nanotechnology-based medicines (i.e., substances that promote healing) **MUST** accompany bioavailability and toxicity data and their evaluation.
- Experimental studies must include at least in vitro results, although in vivo is preferred. Using nano-characterization methods does not automatically qualify as nanomedicine.

Submissions within the scope of the journal are checked for similarities and overlaps using plagiarism and image duplication/manipulation detection systems ([Turnitin](#) and [Proofing](#), if applicable). No numeric thresholds exist for similarity indices, but the EiC always evaluates scientific overlap and image originality before assigning the manuscript to Associate Editors and peer review. The EiC assigns manuscripts to Editors based on expertise and availability. The Editorial System notifies the assigned Editor of the request.

Associate Editors

Associate Editors (AE) receive and review manuscripts within their area of expertise.

a. They decide whether the assignment is appropriate for his/her expertise; if yes, accept the assignment; if not, the manuscript returns to EiC as 'to be re-assigned').

b. Download the file(s) and read the manuscript.

c. Determine scientific merit and whether the manuscript is worth inviting reviewers.

NOTE: If it is not, then the REJECT WITH INTERNAL REVIEW decision is given with a brief justification explaining why the work is being desk rejected. (Note: A manuscript may be inappropriate due to its low scientific merit, incomprehensible language, complete lack of novelty (except for Replication Studies), lack of significance, etc. Associate Editors do not evaluate scope.

d. When an AE finds that the manuscript has enough merit (s)he invites reviewers.

Peer review

PRNANO prefers single-blind peer review.

We consider peer review a form of closed scientific discussion between authors and reviewers moderated by an Editor. The purpose of this discussion is *to assess scientific merit, triage incomplete works, and improve manuscripts* by providing expert advice to the authors.

The first step in this discussion is for an Editor to assess merit and overall quality, followed by soliciting expert opinions from peers.

NOTE: reviews, articles, and short communications are reviewed by at least two independent reviewers. Opinion Papers (Editorials, Perspectives, Opinions, Comments, and Letters) are reviewed by the Editor-in-Chief (EiC), an Associate Editor (AE), and at least one independent reviewer, preferably a Board Member. Case Studies are reviewed by the EiC and at least one expert Board member and/or invited peers.

The minimum requirement is at least two completed reviews. Reviewers are expected to make an objective, impartial evaluation of the manuscript's scientific merit and suggest improvements. Their task is to advise the handling Editor regarding the paper, but **the editors bear the responsibility for the decisions**.

Peer reviews and decisions are communicated to the corresponding author through the submission system, who is responsible for informing the co-authors about the evaluation and the necessary actions. Authors must neither agree with every comment nor accept those but must respond to every suggestion in a separate letter and improve their manuscript accordingly. During the peer-review process, every professional comment will be considered.

After peer review, Editors recommend to the EiC whether to Accept, Revise, or Reject manuscripts based on their scientific merit and quality. All editors and reviewers must write professional justifications to the Journal Office.

The Editor-in-Chief signs decisions based on the handling Editors' recommendations, justification, reviewers' comments, and authors' responses to those comments.

PRNANO aspires to notify authors of the decision as soon as possible, usually within a few weeks from the submission date. Accepted manuscripts enter the publishing process described below.

NOTE: Reviewers are advisors only, and the editor-in-chief and the handling editor bear all responsibilities for the actual decision. Dissenting opinions regarding decisions may be conveyed through the system or in an email to the Editor-in-Chief. They will be followed up and discussed until a solution is found.

Finalizing an accepted manuscript

Authors of manuscripts accepted for publication should resubmit the final version in an MS Word document accompanied by a cover letter, individual figures (5 inches wide and 300 DPI PNG or TIFF formatted), and tables. Figures may be submitted in a true PPT or PPTX file to permit minor modifications.

Authors' Statement

The publisher is legally required to have a declaration of authorship, conflict of interests, and ethical standards statements on file. Accordingly, Authors must certify in a letter that they meet all criteria of [Publication Ethics \(COPE\) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#) and the roles and responsibilities of each author as described in the [Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals](#) of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). **All authors must personally sign this statement** declaring that they meet the above ICMJE criteria for authorship and have approved the most recently submitted version of the manuscript, taking full responsibility for it. Authors may provide this statement in Word or PDF and have their co-authors sign. The Journal Office supplies a template.

Note: If someone is abroad, (s)he may sign a copy of the same letter and email the signed letter as a PDF to the corresponding author, who then emails the consent form signed by all authors to the EiC. **Signatures copied from other PDF documents are unacceptable. Multiple PDF letters are fine, but a co-author's signature and the signed document must be the same document.**

Accepted and posted papers

Accepted and posted manuscripts are PDF files of articles that have undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as copyediting and formatting. Still, they are not yet the definitive version of the record and will undergo additional review. We are providing this version to give the article early visibility, but the authors must proof this galley before the article can be published in its final form.

Please note that errors may be discovered during the production process, which could affect the content and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal.

Deposit Policy / Archiving Policy

All articles receive a unique identifier DOI (10.33218/001c.#####) from *Crossref* and are archived both in *Portico*, and *Crossref* for preservation. We follow [Sherpa/Romeo's](#) green archiving policy, and both pre-print and post-print or publisher's version PDFs can be archived without restrictions.

We support authors who wish to share their work early through the deposition of manuscripts with preprint servers such as bioRxiv or arXiv, have previously been presented at conferences, published as a thesis, or have previously appeared in other "non-journal" venues, such as blogs or posters. However, authors are responsible for updating the archived preprint with the journal reference (including DOI) and a link to the published articles on the appropriate journal website upon publication.

Authors may request updating their work previously published in PRNANO before it is edited into an issue. If justified, we may publish an Errata after an article has been entered into an issue. For details, see "[Handling cases requiring corrections](#)".