

Bylaws for Editorial Policies and Practices

The Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*” is published by L&H Scientific Publishing Company, which have the final responsibility for the *Journal*. The publishing editors from L&H Scientific Publishing Company with Editor-in-chief possess delegated responsibility for overall policy matters about this journal. The journal editors of *Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity* are responsible for the scientific content and editorial matters pertaining to the journal.

The Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*” accepts for publication those manuscripts that significantly contribute to the *Community in Physical and Social Sciences* and are scientifically sound, important to the corresponding fields, and in a satisfactory form.

The Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*” has an **Editorial Board** whose members are appointed for three-year terms by the Editor-in-Chief upon recommendation of the editors, after consultation with the publishing editors from the L&H Scientific Publishing Company publisher. Board members play an important role in the editorial processes and management of the Journal. They provides proper advices on editorial policy and on specific papers for which special assistance is needed, is involved in the formal appeals process, and place inputs on the selection of referees and the identification of new referees.

Content of Regular and Review Papers

The Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*” publishes **new results**. Thus, prior publication of the same results generally will preclude consideration of a later paper. Confirmation of previously published results of unusual importance can be considered as new, as can significant null results. Papers advancing new theoretical views on fundamental principles or theories must contain convincing arguments that the new predictions and interpretations are distinguishable from existing knowledge, at least in principle, and do not contradict established experimental results. Mathematical and computational papers that do not have a clear relationship to physics are generally not suitable for the Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*”.

- In general, authors should keep review material to a minimum. Even so, some review and reprise of past work are necessary and appropriate if the paper can be made more understandable and self-contained thereby.
- Papers should be **clearly written** in good scientific English, in a style consistent with that of the Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*”. Special attention should be paid to **readability**, so as to render papers understandable to readers outside a narrow specialty.
- **New terminology** should be introduced only when clearly needed, which should be appropriate and convey to the reader an accurate impression of its meaning. New terminology should be serious, but it should not be introduced in titles. *Excessive use of acronyms should be avoided.*
- Publication of ongoing work in a **series of papers** should be avoided in the Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*”. The journal encourages a single comprehensive article for publication except for a *Short Communications, Letters to*

Editors and **Comments**. However, the author still cannot publish series of papers in the sections of *Short Communications* and Letters to Editors.

- Although there is no limit to the length of regular and review articles, the **appropriate length of the manuscript** depends on the extent of the information presented. The authors should follow the journal requirements to prepare manuscripts for publications, which can be found from the [journal website](#). Readers benefit from complete referencing, which is necessary to place any work in the context of the current state of research. Therefore, authors should ensure that their citations of previously published work are comprehensive at the time of submission. This includes references to books and to published conference proceedings not only including abstracts. Authors should also add to the references any works published during a due course of the review process.
- Papers describing **proposed experiments** fall into a special category. For such papers to be acceptable, the experiments must be demonstrated to be novel and feasible. It is the author's responsibility to show that their proposal is likely to stimulate research that might not otherwise be undertaken.
- Materials previously published in an abbreviated form such as in *Short Communications* or *Letters to Editors* or in conference proceedings) may provide a useful basis for a more detailed article in the Journal "*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*".
- The comprehensive article should present relatively more information and cause a substantial improvement for a better understanding of the subject. Reproduction of figures, tables, and text material from previous publication should reduce to a minimum, which must be referenced in a proper way. In order to reproduce figures, tables, etc., from different journals, authors must provide that they have complied with the copyright requirements of the publisher of the other journal. Publication of material in a thesis does not preclude publication of appropriate parts of that material in the Journal "*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*".

Short Papers

The Journal "*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*" publishes short papers, including *Short Communications*, *Letters to Editor*, and *Comments*. *The scientific content of all sections of the Journal is judged by the same criteria*. For different purpose, the sections where the papers are submitted are distinguished from through the different purposes. Each paper should have an abstract. Short papers are limited to six journal pages; exceptions will be considered for *Comments*. For information on how to estimate length, see the information available on the Authors, General Information subpage at [the journal website](#).

- **Short Communications** in the Journal "*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*" are intended for the accelerated publication of important new results. Authors may follow a **Short communications** with a more complete account as a regular article in the Journal "*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*". Short Communications are given priority in editorial processing and production to minimize the time between receipt and publication. Therefore, authors should justify the need for priority handling in their cover letter of submission. A series of Short Communications by one group on a particular subject should be avoided.

- **Letters to Editors** is an account of completed research that is not appropriate for a regular article but must meet the *journal* standards of scientific quality. Announcements of planned research, progress reports, and preliminary results are generally not suitable for publication as a Letters to Editors, which will follow the normal publication schedule.
- **Comments** are publications that criticize or correct papers of other authors previously published in the Journal “*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*”. Each Comment should contain an **abstract** and should state clearly the paper to which it refers. To be considered for publication, a Comment must be written in a collegial tone (free from polemics) and must be pertinent and without egregious errors. A Reply to a Comment must also conform to these requirements. Editorial procedures for processing Comments are described in the following section.
- The **Errata** section includes notices regarding errors or omissions in papers previously published. Besides the standard Erratum, several special categories of documents may appear in this section. In the online journal, each of these documents involves bidirectional links between the original article and the document in the Errata section. The category of the corrective document is indicated in its title and in the link from the original article. The standard Erratum is a statement by the authors of the original paper that briefly describes the correction(s) and, where appropriate, any effects on the conclusions of the paper. A Publisher's Note is a notice that the article has been corrected subsequent to publication. Such corrections are made to correct typographical or production errors that involve significant metadata (e.g., title or byline) or have a significant impact on the reader's ability to understand the article. Such corrections are normally made only shortly after publication, with approval of publishers' management, and are not made for scientific errors or omissions. The Publisher's Note indicates the correction and when it was made.
- A Retraction is a withdrawal notice that the paper should not be regarded as part of the scientific literature. Possible reasons for this include, among others, presentation of invalid results and inclusion of results that were published previously by the same authors in substantially similar form. To protect the integrity of the record, the withdrawn paper is **not** removed from the online journal, but notice of Retraction is given. Retractions are sometimes published by the authors when they have discovered substantial scientific errors; in other cases, the editors conclude that Retraction is appropriate. In all cases, the Retraction indicates the reason for the action and who is responsible for the decision. If a Retraction is made without the unanimous agreement of the authors, the approval of the Editor-in-Chief of the *journal* is required.

Editorial Procedures

Usually, *one or more* **referees** are selected by the editors for each manuscript. Referee reports are advisory to the editors, which are generally transmitted by the editors to the authors. So the referee reports should be written in a collegial manner. The editors may withhold or edit these reports for some reasons. In the judgment of the editors, if a paper is clearly unsuitable for *Journal of Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*, such a paper should be rejected without external review. However, authors of such rejected papers have the same right to appeal as do other authors.

- Any resubmission of papers with revision should be accompanied by a summary of the changes made, and brief responses to all recommendations and criticisms. The rebuttal material will normally be forwarded to reviewers, and so should be written in a collegial manner. Remarks that authors wish to address solely to the editors should be clearly identified and separated from the summary and response. Authors should not send a version of the manuscript annotated to show the changes, as this can lead to confusion and delay in processing.
- A manuscript may be sent to additional referees if warranted, either by request of the authors or by editorial decision. In most cases the new referee will be provided with previous correspondence on the manuscript, but not with the identity of the previous referee(s). However, members in Editorial board may receive this information.
- Since the referee is usually best qualified to judge a paper, the author should direct his or her responses to the items raised in the referee report. In general, very long rebuttal letters explaining contentious points in a manuscript should be avoided in favor of clarifying alterations in the manuscript itself.
- Papers are accepted for publication based on favorable recommendations by the referee(s). On the other hand, the editors can and will seek additional opinions when in their judgment such action seems called for. It is the policy of this journal that every effort be made to arrive at a decision on disposition within a reasonable time.
- After acceptance of a manuscript, if further information that seems to warrant investigation is received, the editors will regard it as an obligation to reconsider their decision.
- Authors should state whether the paper they submit has been **previously considered for publication** in any of the other journals. They should also provide information about other recent relevant unpublished work of theirs.
- When a manuscript has several authors, one of them, the corresponding author, should be designated to receive and respond to correspondence from the editors. This designation can be changed upon notification of the editors. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to represent all those involved with the work reported.

By submission of the manuscript, the corresponding author certifies:

- The paper must represent original work of the listed authors.
- The manuscript as presented accurately reflects the new scientific results.
- All of the authors made significant contributions to the concept, design, execution, or interpretation of the research study.
- All those who made significant contributions were offered the opportunity to be listed as authors.
- All of the listed authors are aware of and agree to the submission of this manuscript.
- The manuscript has not been published, and is not now and will not be under consideration by another journal while it is considered here.
- As part of the submission, the authors have provided any relevant information to the editors.
- The authors accept the established procedures for selecting manuscripts for publication.

Authors may not present data and other results obtained by others as if they were their own. Nor may authors incorporate without attribution text from another work (by themselves or others), even when summarizing past results or background material. If a direct quotation is appropriate, the quotation should be clearly indicated as such and the original source should be properly cited. Papers that have been found to be in violation of this rule will be rejected. In such cases, resubmission of the manuscript, even with the plagiarized text removed, is not ordinarily allowed. However, the editors may allow exceptions to this policy if warranted by special circumstances.

Authors may request that particular individuals not be **chosen as referees**. Such requests are usually honored, although it is customary to give authors whose work is criticized in a manuscript an opportunity to respond to the criticism. Authors are encouraged to submit a list of experts whom they consider especially suited to referee their paper. Such a list is particularly useful when a manuscript treats a highly specialized subject on which papers are infrequently published. The editors, however, are not constrained to select a referee from that list.

We do not agree on requests from authors that we withhold their identities from the referees. Such "double-blind" reviewing has been discontinued. In some circumstances information about a manuscript considered by the Journal "*Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity*" and subsequently submitted to another journal may be provided to the editor of that journal. Such information might include the comments and identities of referees.

The reviewing procedure for **Comments**, papers that criticize others' work, is usually as follows:

- The paper is first sent to the author(s) whose work is being criticized. These author(s) act as reviewers (usually not anonymously) and should send a **report** suitable for transmittal to the author (not a Reply).
- After suitable exchanges between the involved parties, the Comment, along with relevant correspondence, is sent to an "uninvolved" referee for anonymous review. If this referee recommends acceptance of the paper, then the authors whose work is being commented on are given the opportunity to write a Reply for possible simultaneous publication. This Reply will also be reviewed (usually by the "uninvolved" referee).
- After the Comment and Reply have been accepted for publication, the author of the Comment is sent a copy of the Reply for his or her information, but should not alter the Comment unless requested to do so by the editors. The Comment and Reply usually are published in the same issue, with the Reply immediately following the Comment. If there is undue delay in the preparation and review of the Reply, the Comment may be published before the Reply. The normal publication schedule is followed.

Author Appeals

Authors may appeal a rejection of their paper by the editors. In the case of a formal appeal, the paper and all relevant information, including the identities of the referees, will be sent to a member of the Editorial Board. The Board member may review the case on the existing record or may seek additional expert opinion. The Board member will

present an advisory opinion to the editors, which will be sent to authors and/or referees with the Board member's name.

If a Board member has provided a referee report on a paper prior to appeal, another Board member should review the paper on appeal. Authors may suggest a few Board members they feel are appropriate (or not appropriate) to conduct the review, but the editors are not bound by such suggestions. If there is no suitable Board member available, the editors may find an appropriate scientist to consider a paper under appeal as an *ad hoc* Board member.

The author of a paper that has been rejected subsequent to an Editorial Board review may request that the case be reviewed by the Editor-in-Chief. This request should be addressed to the Editor, who will forward the entire file to the Editor-in-Chief. Such an appeal must be based on the fairness of the procedures followed, and must not be a request for another scientific review. The questions to be answered in this review are: Were our procedures followed appropriately and did the paper receive a fair hearing? A decision by the Editor-in-Chief is the final level of review.

Receipt Dates

Each paper, when published, carries a receipt date indicating when the manuscript was first submitted to the journal through e-submission. If authors make substantive changes in a manuscript or if they hold it for an unusually long time after it has been returned to them with a referee's report, the paper will be given a "revised manuscript receipt date." In such cases, the authors may be required to revise references to include material published since the original submission of the manuscript. In cases of especially lengthy delays the original paper is considered withdrawn, and the resubmitted version is considered to be a new paper and is given a new receipt date.

Author Inquiries

For papers accepted for publication and sent to production, information about their status in the production process is available via a similar service maintained by the production vendor. The editors welcome suggestions from authors and referees regarding improvements in editorial and refereeing procedures.