

Peer Review Policy for *Anthropocene Coasts*

All papers published in *Anthropocene Coasts* undergo rigorous peer review with the exception of any editorial or introductory material that is clearly marked as such.

Criteria for Publication

Manuscript acceptance is based on the quality of its science, its interest to readers, and the scientific importance of the research. Research published in *Anthropocene Coasts* must also conform to ethical standards of experimentation and research integrity. Reviewers are referred to the *Anthropocene Coasts* [Publishing Policy](#) and [Instructions to Authors](#) for more information.

Peer Review Process

Peer review for *Anthropocene Coasts* is single-blind, wherein the authors are identified to the reviewers, but the reviewers are not identified to the authors.

When a manuscript is submitted, the Editorial Office screens the submission to ensure that it meets the formatting requirements outlined in the Instructions to Authors, that the supplied information is consistent and correct, and that the author questions have been answered appropriately. Once all of this is in order, the Editorial Office will assign the manuscript to one of the Co-Editors for consideration.

In most cases the Co-Editor will assign the manuscript to an Associate Editor, who handles the review process, but the Co-Editor may decline without review those manuscripts judged inappropriate for the Journal. If the manuscript is accepted for review, the Associate Editor will seek advice from a minimum of two reviewers selected for their knowledge of, and their experience in, the subject discussed in the manuscript. Authors may recommend preferred individuals to review their manuscript, but ultimately, the handling Associate Editor decides which reviewers are invited to review the manuscript. Reviewers are invited, in confidence, to recommend on the suitability of the submission for publication and to provide comments to the authors and the Associate Editor.

The Associate Editor considers the comments provided by the reviewers and makes one of the following recommendations: reject, reject and resubmit, accept, accept with minor revisions, or accept with major revisions. The Co-Editor considers the Associate Editor's recommendation, the reviewers' comments, and his own assessment and makes the final decision. The Co-Editor retains full responsibility for all decisions regarding the manuscript.

When a revised manuscript is submitted (following a decision of either major or minor revisions), the Associate Editor may send the revised manuscript out for re-review or make a recommendation based on the revision. If a second round of review is deemed necessary, the manuscript may be sent to the same reviewers as before, or may be sent to new reviewers. Depending on the willingness of the original reviewer(s) to re-review the manuscript and (or) their availability. Once again, the Associate Editor makes a recommendation and the Co-Editor makes the final decision.

Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers and Associate Editors are expected to recuse themselves from the evaluation of papers in which they may have a real or perceived conflict of interest. Conflicts of interest may include financial interests in any aspect of a product or method under discussion, personal relationships (positive or negative) with authors, interest in competing research, or bias concerning the research.

Reviewer Authority

Reviewers are advisory to the Co-Editors and Editorial Board and provide recommendations, but they do not make any decisions on the acceptance or rejection of manuscripts.

Ethical Considerations

All statements made by reviewers must be adequately supported so that the Co-Editor can make a well-informed decision regarding the paper.

Reviewers must ensure that reviews are written in a respectful, professional manner, and are free of any kind of prejudice, especially gender and racial stereotyping.

Reviewers are expected to maintain confidentiality regarding the content of any manuscript they handle. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted paper should not be used for the reviewer's own research except with the consent of the author(s).

For detailed information on the editorial and ethical responsibilities of Authors, the Executive Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Reviewers, and the Publisher, please refer to our [Publishing Policy](#).