Reviewer Guidelines

IEEE Access
About IEEE Access

- **Format**: Open Access
- **Frequency**: Continuous
- **Publishing Mode**: Online only
- **Submission to Publication**: 4-6 weeks (typical)
- **Topics**: All topics in IEEE
- **Average Acceptance Rate**: 28%
- **Model**: Binary Peer Review
- **Article Processing Charge**: US $1,950
- **Peer-Review Process**: Single-anonymized
- **A minimum of two reviewers per each round of review**
- **No page limits**
- **Hosts IEEE Society/Council Sections as well as Special Sections on trending topics**
- **Indexed by Google Scholar, WoS, Scopus, JCR, SCIE, DOAJ, etc.**
- **Article Types**: Research article, Topical review, Theory, Survey, Perspective, Applied research, Negative result, Methods, Tutorial, Standards, Comment, Reply, Debate, Exposition, Meta-analysis, Unsolved problem
- **Copyright**: CC BY or CCBY-NC-ND

**Bibliometrics**

- **Impact Factor (2022)**: 3.9
- **Eigen Factor (2022)**: 0.32872
- **Article Influence Score (2022)**: 0.685
- **Immediacy Index (2022)**: 0.7
- **CiteScore (2022)**: 9.0
- **SCImago journal rank (2022)**: 0.926

**Editor in Chief**: Prof. Derek Abbott (University of Adelaide, Australia)
Stages of Peer-Review in IEEE Access

**Article Submission by Author**
- Articles are expected to use the double-column, single-spaced IEEE Access template format, include biographies of authors and answer a few custom questions.
- Authors are expected to disclose any information pertinent to the authenticity and integrity of the article.

**Prescreening Checks by Administrators**
- Automated plagiarism check using industry standard software.
- Check that formatting is to IEEE style.
- Author list compared with Prohibited Authors List.
- Evaluation of scope and technical merits by a Senior Editor as needed.

**Article Assessment by Associate Editor**
- Associate Editor is expected to:
  - Ensure scope and sufficient technical merits for peer-review.
  - Ensure that authors have responded to reviewer comments for resubmissions.
  - Evaluate supporting materials, multimedia, etc.
  - Invite reviewers that are peers in the field and assign a minimum of two reviewers.

**Review by Peers in the Field**
- The peer-review process is single-anonymized where the identities of the reviewers are not known to the authors, but the reviewers know the identities of the authors.
- Reviewers are expected to provide feedback in 7 days.
- Reviewers should not run manuscripts in a plagiarism software or AI tools.

**Manuscript Decision by Associate Editor**
- The Associate Editor makes one of the three following decisions based on the feedback by the reviewers and their own overall assessment of the manuscript:
  - Accept
  - Reject (updates required before resubmission)
  - Reject (do not encourage resubmit)

**Processing of Accepted Articles and Publication by Production**
- Only minor changes are expected to be made on the manuscripts after acceptance for publication.
- Once the final manuscript files are submitted by the authors, the accepted version is published on IEEE Xplore.
- Once the page proofs are approved by the authors the final version will replace the early access version on Xplore.
Stages of Review Activity

Invitation to review: Agree or Decline?

Agree

Conducting a Review

Submission of Feedback

Get Recognition

Things to consider when agreeing to review a manuscript
- In my area of expertise?
- Can I complete in 1-2 weeks?
- Do I have a COI with the authors?
- Can I keep the information contains in an article under review confidential?
Agree only if your answer is “yes” to all

Things to evaluate in a manuscript
- Technical strength: theoretical/experimental depth, strength of analysis, quality of supporting data and results, benchmarking and validation, technical flaws
- Contributions to the body of knowledge: unique advancement, literature review, comparison to the state of the art
- Comprehensive presentation: proper reporting of the research and findings, detailed layout with illustrations, logical flow of information, reproducibility of the experiments/simulations

Things that are expected
- Provide your feedback: summarize the work, comment on its overall merits and drawbacks, provide constructive and substantial feedback
- Make a recommendation**: Accept, Reject (updates required before resubmission) or Reject (do not encourage resubmit).

How?
Choose to receive credit on Web of Science. Use WoS credits or review confirmation emails for career advancements, visa/immigration applications, etc.
For official acknowledgment of your review service, contact the editorial office.

** Recommend “Accept” if only minor edits are required and recommend “Reject (updates required before resubmission)” only if you feel the article could be improved after one round of revision.
**Review Instructions**

**Do**

- Evaluate the manuscript and provide constructive, substantive feedback
- Summarize the work and comment on its overall merits and drawbacks
- If the authors have overlooked important prior research, recommend specific topic areas to improve their literature review and/or better highlight the advantages over the state-of-the-art
- Inform the editor if you have any concern on the article. Leave your comments in the “Confidential comments to the Editor” section
- Evaluate author responses to comments of all previous reviewers if it is a resubmission (click “View Author’s Response” at the top of the reviewer page)
- Be authentic and responsible for the comments you return on the article under review
- You may request a deadline extension if needed (maximum 1-2 weeks)

**Don’t**

- Agree to review or submit feedback if you do not think you have sufficient research background in the field
- Submit review if you have a conflict of interest (COI) with any of the authors
- Disclose information contained in the article under review to others before publication
- Contact the authors of the article regarding their article under review
- Reveal your identity in the review
- Recommend excessive references of your own or of a particular person or research group
- Recommend references that are not relevant to the article under review
- Submit review without justifying your recommendation
- Use offensive language in the comments
- Use plagiarism software or AI chatbot tool (This may breach the confidentiality and undermine your expertise and insight)