

Reviewer Guidelines for *Anthropocene Coasts*

For Reviewers

Anthropocene Coasts is governed by a rigorous peer review process. We also acknowledge and appreciate the work done by reviewers and their contribution to the success of the Journal. Please consult the guidelines for reviewers below. For your convenience, we also make our guidelines available as a PDF download.

Introduction

Anthropocene Coasts is an innovative international partnership journal, jointly developed and co-owned by Canadian Science Publishing (CSP) and East China Normal University (ECNU). Material published in *Anthropocene Coasts* is governed by the Creative Commons Attribution license CC BY 4.0 (this conforms with the licensing requirements of all major funding agencies).

The contact information for the Journal is as follows:

Editorial Office

Anthropocene Coasts

State Key Laboratory for Estuarine and Coastal Research
East China Normal University
3663 N. Zhongshan Road
Shanghai 200062, China
anc@cdnsiencepub.com

Reviews of manuscripts and correspondence directly related to the manuscripts under review are administered through the [online peer review system](#).

Journal Scope

Anthropocene Coasts publishes multidisciplinary research that aims to understand and predict the effects of human activities, including climate change, on estuarine and coastal regions. *Anthropocene Coasts* publishes primary research articles, research reviews, topical communications, and letters.

The *Anthropocene* is the period during which human activities have had a marked environmental impact on the Earth, and *Coasts* embraces all aspects of the land–sea interface. *Anthropocene Coasts* therefore seeks to identify and document the influence of human activities on contemporary coastal processes (physical, biological and chemical processes across the land–sea interface) and the implications for other aspects of these systems including social, economic, and legal considerations.

Improved understanding of changes in the structure and function of systems and the cumulative impact of a succession of imposed changes is critical if adaptation to change is to be appro-

Table of Contents

[For Reviewers](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Editorial Office](#)

[Journal Scope](#)

[Criteria for Acceptance for Publication](#)

[Roles & Responsibilities](#)

[Qualifications](#)

[Conflicts of Interest](#)

[Confidentiality](#)

[Reviewer Anonymity](#)

[Reviewer Authority](#)

[Timeliness](#)

[Ethical Considerations](#)

[English Language Improvement Service](#)

[Reviewer Questions](#)

appropriate and timely. Anthropogenic effects on coastal regions can be difficult to define and there are often many differing perspectives on what constitutes appropriate solutions. Research that explores potential solutions to these complex issues is encouraged and can include topics such as:

- Changes in coastal hazard patterns and the implications for safety;
- The role of coastal ecosystem services and how these may change;
- Implications of population growth and urban expansion on the coast;
- Adaptation in response to change and methods to enhance coastal sustainability;
- Interactions with society (including aspects such as economics, policy/legislation and regulation, social mobility, technology, engineering and risk management);
- Observations, modelling and theoretical advances to better detect and understand change.

Submissions that do not have a clear human or multidisciplinary component are more suited to one of the existing discipline-based journals and are unlikely to be considered for publication.

Criteria for Acceptance 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.

Roles & Responsibilities

The role of the reviewer is not to “nurture” the authors, but rather to evaluate the work and provide constructive feedback. No editing by reviewers is required during the review stage.

Qualifications

Reviewers are advisors to the Co-Editors and Editorial Board and should serve only in their areas of expertise. A reviewer who feels inadequately qualified to evaluate a paper should decline to review the paper.

Conflicts of Interest

A reviewer, who cannot give an unbiased opinion about a paper because of personal relationships, competing research, financial interests, etc., should declare this bias or conflict of interest to the Editorial Board and decline to review the paper.

Confidentiality

Reviewers must treat the paper and the review as confidential communications. If a reviewer wishes to seek expert advice from an associate, he or she should consult the handling Associate Editor before proceeding. The associate must also honour the confidentiality of the document.

Reviewer Anonymity

Anthropocene Coasts manuscripts undergo a single-blind peer review process. Reviewers must therefore remain anonymous. If reviewers upload an annotated file, they must ensure that the identifying name in the document properties and comments in the text are changed to “anonymous”.

Reviewer Authority

Reviewers are advisory to the Editorial Board and provide recommendations, but do not make decisions on the acceptance or rejection of a paper.

Timeliness

A reviewer who is unable to complete the review of a paper in an appropriate time frame should notify the Editorial Office and agree on a new deadline, or decline to review the paper.

Ethical Considerations

All statements made by the reviewer must be adequately supported so that the Co-Editors may 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.

The reviewer should call to the attention of the Co-Editor and/or Editorial Board any failure by an author to cite relevant work by other scientists, as well as any published or unpublished papers the reviewer is aware of that would constitute plagiarism or duplicate publication.

Reviewers should also call to the attention of the Co-Editor and/or Editorial Board any failure by an author to adhere to the ethical standards and policies of their area of study. Reviewers are referred to the *Anthropocene Coasts* [Instructions to Authors](#) for guidelines.

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.

English Language Improvement Service

Submissions will be screened by the Editorial Office to assess the basic quality of the English prior to being sent for review.

If the reviewer judges that the English of the manuscript is too poor to meet the standard of quality for publication, he or she can recommend that the author(s) submit the manuscript to an English language improvement service prior to submitting the manuscript for reconsideration.

Canadian Science Publishing has partnered with Editage to offer pre-submission editing services to authors. The services offered by Editage will help authors, particularly those for whom English is not their first language, craft well-written manuscripts for submission to *Anthropocene Coasts*, making it easier for peer reviewers to assess the science of a manuscript and reducing the risk that a paper with good scientific content will be rejected because of a lack of clarity.

Please note that language editing does not guarantee that the manuscript will be sent out for peer review or accepted for publication. Articles accepted for publication in *Anthropocene Coasts* will be copy-edited as part of the production process.



Reviewer Questions

You will be asked to consider the following questions and to input your responses within the online peer review system.

1. How would you rate this contribution in terms of quality of its science?
2. How would you rate this contribution in terms of interest to readers of *Anthropocene Coasts*?
3. How would you rate the scientific importance of this contribution?
4. Would this contribution be of interest to the general public, therefore warranting consideration as featured content (i.e., press release, blog post, newsletters, etc.) if accepted?