

Peer Review Policy

Discontinuity, Nonlinearity, and Complexity

Effective and reviewed: July 2026

Discontinuity, Nonlinearity, and Complexity applies a transparent editorial process designed to obtain independent expert assessment while protecting confidentiality and editorial independence.

Review model and purpose

The journal uses external, single-anonymous peer review: reviewers know the identities of the authors, while reviewer identities are not disclosed to authors. Editorial decisions are based on scholarly merit, methodological soundness, relevance to the journal scope, originality, clarity, and compliance with research and publication ethics.

Editorial screening

New submissions are screened by an editor for scope, completeness, authorship and disclosure information, basic methodological suitability, and indications of plagiarism, duplicate submission, or other ethical concerns. A manuscript may be declined without external review when it is clearly outside scope, incomplete, insufficiently scholarly, or inconsistent with journal policies.

Reviewer selection and independence

Research articles are normally evaluated by at least two independent reviewers with relevant subject expertise. Editors avoid reviewers with recent collaboration, close institutional relationships, personal relationships, direct competition, financial interests, or other conflicts that could reasonably affect impartiality.

Reviewer suggestions supplied by authors may be considered but are independently verified and are not binding. Submissions authored by an editor or editorial board member are handled by another qualified editor who is not involved with the work.

Confidentiality and use of manuscripts

Editors and reviewers must treat manuscripts, supplementary files, correspondence, and review reports as confidential. Unpublished information may not be used for personal advantage or shared without authorization. Reviewers must not upload confidential manuscript material to public or third-party generative AI systems.

Review reports and timing

Reviewers should provide specific, evidence-based, and respectful comments addressing the contribution, methods, analysis, interpretation, presentation, references, and any ethical concerns. The normal review target is 21 days. Extensions may be granted when necessary, and authors are informed when substantial delay is expected.

Decisions and revisions

Possible decisions include accept, minor revision, major revision, and decline. Review reports advise the editor; the editor makes the final decision and may seek an additional review when reports conflict or specialized expertise is needed. Revised manuscripts should include a point-by-point response. Acceptance is not guaranteed after revision.

Appeals and complaints

Authors may submit a reasoned appeal identifying a material factual or procedural error. Disagreement with the outcome alone is not sufficient. Appeals are reviewed by an editor who was not the sole decision-maker whenever practicable. Complaints about reviewer conduct, confidentiality, conflicts, or process integrity may be sent to the journal contact or publisher. Retaliation against a complainant acting in good faith is prohibited.

Research integrity concerns

Suspected fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, image manipulation, duplicate publication, undisclosed conflicts, or inappropriate authorship may pause review while the concern is assessed. The journal may contact authors, institutions, funders, or other journals when appropriate and legally permissible.

Standards and references

This policy is informed by the [COPE Core Practices](#) and the [ICMJE Recommendations](#).

Questions, complaints, or appeals may be sent to the journal contact listed on the journal website or to albertluo@lhscientificpublishing.com.