EDITORIAL

JINT Editorial, April 2023

Kimon P. Valavanis[1]

Dear Colleagues:

In this editorial, I would like to provide, once more, rationale, clarifications and justifications regarding the paper review process, which (will) help authors prepare and submit a strong and technically sound paper. By doing so, one objective is to facilitate better and more accurate reviews. I apologize a-priori if this editorial appears 'repetitive' to some; but it is important, given the large number of papers we receive.

To begin with, the Editor-in-Chief (EIC) reviews every submitted paper before assigning it to a handling editor. For about 50% of submitted papers a 'Reject without Review' decision is made, and for about 20% a 'Revise Before Review' decision is returned to the submitting author. The main reasons for these two decisions are the following (although the list is not exclusive): high overlap with previously published work; insufficient or no information about novelty, originality, distinct features of the proposed technique/approach; comparison with similar work; similarities and differences with other approaches and contributions. In addition, it appears that when it comes to results, authors do not provide accurate information about the 'type' of results they include in the paper. To be specific, there is a huge difference between actual experiments, simulated experiments using a software tool (i.e., ROS/Gazebo), simulations (say MatLab based), numerical examples, and, studies using existing databases. I find hard to believe that we, as technical people, do not know the difference! Because we do know, let us be accurate in what we state in our papers.

One more clarification I need to make relates to regular versus short papers – I did report on this issue before, but here it is again. Although almost all the submitted papers are submitted as 'regular papers', an accept decision may be 'accept as regular paper' or 'accept as short paper'. This decision is based on the paper contents, reviewer comments, handling editor's recommendation, and the EIC's final decision. All accepted peer reviewed papers count as an archive publication – period, no discussion. However, we all know the difference between 'regular' and 'short' papers, and this is adopted in most / the best publication forums, for example see the IEEE Transactions.

In any case, we have revisited this issue in JINT. We recognize its importance. We understand that authors may be skeptical at times about the accept decision. And although during my tenure as EIC we have received less than 20 requests requesting clarification for regular vs. short paper accept, we will update all relevant information in the journal's web.

Last, but not least, we are here because of you. Thus, we will continue closing any 'loopholes' that may create concerns. After all, we are all in the same boat and we have a common goal: make JINT the best publication.

Enjoy the issue.

Kimon P. Valavanis
Editor-in-Chief

✉ Kimon P. Valavanis
Kimon.Valavanis@du.edu

[1] D. F. Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, USA