

Journal of Small Satellites (JoSS)

Guidelines for Authors, Editors, and Reviewers

JoSS gratefully acknowledges the American Meteorological Society (AMS) for allowing the Journal to adapt for our use the following guidelines, previously developed and published by AMS and based on guidelines published by the American Geophysical Union (AGU) and the American Chemical Society (ACS).

Author Obligations in the JoSS Peer-Reviewed Publication Process

1. An author's central obligation is to present a concise and accurate account of the research performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.
2. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to public sources of information (literature and data) and methodology used to permit the author's peers to test the paper's scientific conclusions.
3. All funding sources should be identified in the manuscript. Authors should disclose to the editor any financial arrangement with a research sponsor that could give the appearance of a conflict of interest.
4. An author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature and motivation for the present work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, cannot be used without permission of the author of the work being used.
5. It is unethical for an author to copy text, figures, or tables (i.e., plagiarize) from other work without attribution. Even self-plagiarism (or auto-plagiarism), defined as copying from previous work by the author, could be considered unethical as it may involve copyright infringement, i.e., as a condition of publication in JoSS, authors are required to transfer intellectual property rights to JoSS, hence, authors no longer "own" previously published work.
6. Fragmentation of research papers should be avoided. A scientist who has done extensive work on a topic or a group of related topics should organize publications so that each paper gives a complete account of a particular aspect of the general study.
7. It is unethical for an author to publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one peer-reviewed paper.
8. It is inappropriate to submit manuscripts with an obvious commercial intent.
9. An author should make no material changes to a paper after it has been accepted. If there is a compelling reason to make changes (other than to correct typographical errors), the author is obligated to inform the editor directly of the nature of the desired change. Only the editor has the final authority to approve any such requested changes.
10. A criticism of a published paper may be justified and is allowed in a "Comment & Reply" sequence; however, personal criticism is never considered acceptable.

11. Only individuals who have made a substantive intellectual contribution to the published research should be listed as co-authors. The contributions usually involve significantly helping with the acquisition of data or analysis and/or contributions to the interpretation of information. A deceased person who met the authorship requirements may be designated as a co-author. The corresponding author accepts the responsibility of having included as authors all persons who meet these criteria for authorship and none who do not. Other contributors who do not meet the authorship criteria should be appropriately acknowledged in the article. It is unethical for the corresponding author to submit work without all living coauthors having seen the final version of the article, agree with the major conclusions, and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Editor Obligations in the JoSS Peer-Reviewed Publication Process

1. An editor should give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its own merits without regard to the author's race, gender, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy. All authors should be treated with fairness, courtesy, objectivity, and honesty.
2. An editor *must* protect the confidentiality of all reviewers unless the reviewer reveals their identity to the author.
3. An editor should process manuscripts promptly.
4. The editor has complete responsibility and authority to accept a submitted paper for publication or to reject it. The editor may confer informally with associate editors or reviewers for an evaluation of the work to use in making this decision.
5. Editors must provide reviewers with written, explicit instructions on the journal's expectations for the scope, content, quality, and timeliness of their reviews to promote thoughtful, fair, constructive, and informative critique of submitted work.
6. The editor and the editorial staff should not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than other JoSS staff, reviewers, and potential reviewers. Particular caution should be used with electronic transmittal of submissions and related correspondence, which could contain identifying information in addresses, subject lines, or headings.
7. An editor should respect the intellectual independence of authors.
8. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript authored (or co-authored) by an editor and submitted to the editor's journal should be delegated to some other qualified person, such as another editor of that journal. Editors should avoid situations of real or perceived conflicts of interest. If an editor chooses to participate in an ongoing scientific debate within his journal, the editor should arrange for some other qualified person to take editorial responsibility.
9. Editors should avoid situations of real or perceived conflicts of interest. Such conflicts include, but are not limited to, handling papers from present and former students, from colleagues with whom the editor has a close professional relationship, and from those in the same institution. Any financial arrangement with sponsors that could lead to the appearance of an editorial conflict of interest should be disclosed to the Editor-in-Chief.
10. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript should not be used in an editor's own research except with the consent of the author or after the work has been published.
11. If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a paper published in an editor's journal are erroneous, the editor should facilitate publication of an appropriate paper pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it.

Reviewer Obligations in the JoSS Peer-Reviewed Publication Process

1. Because of the critical importance of peer-review to the publication process, every scientist has an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.
2. A chosen reviewer who feels inadequately qualified or lacks the time to judge the research reported in a manuscript should indicate it promptly to the editor.
3. A reviewer should endeavor to complete the review in a timely fashion. Reviewers should promptly notify the editor if the review cannot be completed by the time frame agreed upon with the editor.
4. A reviewer of a manuscript should judge objectively the quality of the manuscript and respect the intellectual independence of the authors. In no case is personal criticism appropriate.
5. A reviewer should be sensitive even to the appearance of a conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is closely related to the reviewer's work in progress or published. If in doubt, the reviewer should indicate the potential conflict promptly to the editor.
6. A reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom the reviewer has a close personal or professional connection if the relationship would bias judgment of the manuscript.
7. A reviewer should treat a manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. It should neither be shown to nor discussed with others except, in special cases, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought; in that event, the identities of those consulted should be disclosed to the editor.
8. Reviewers should explain and support their judgments adequately so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
9. A reviewer should be alert to failure of authors to cite relevant work by other scientists. A reviewer should call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper, or to any manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal.
10. Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author.
11. Reviewers are not allowed to make any use of the work described in the manuscript or take advantage of the knowledge they gained by reviewing it until it is published or by consent of the author.