

PEER REVIEW POLICY

Articles and notes

All articles submitted to Meteorologica are subject of a rigorous peer review process before publication.

When a paper is submitted to Meteorologica an editor is assigned. The assigned editor performs a preliminary screening of the article in order to check that the topic is within the scope of the journal, the scientific quality of the manuscript is within the standards of the journal and that the presentation follows the rules indicated in the manuscript preparation guidelines. If the editor finds that the article may fail to fulfill any of above mentioned requirements he/she can consult with the Editor in Chief about if the paper can enter the peer review process or if it is rejected without entering the peer review process.

In the first case the assigned editor will design two anonymous reviewers based on their expertise in the subject of the submitted manuscript. Meteorologica adopts a single-blinded method for peer reviewing of submitted manuscripts. Invited reviewers should know that accepting to review a manuscript in consideration for publication in Meteorologica implies the acceptance of the ethical guidelines of the journal (see reviewer's obligation section for more details)

The assigned editor will make a decision based on the reviewer's recommendation. If there is significant disagreement between the comments of the two reviewers and if the editor finds it necessary, a third reviewer can be invited. Editors can also include additional comments.

After all Reviewers provide their comments the editor makes a decision about the manuscript which can be: to accept the manuscript, to reject the manuscript, to suggest major changes or to suggest minor changes to the manuscript. At this stage, Reviewer comments will be handed to the Authors who will prepare a corrected version of the manuscript following the suggestions made by the Reviewers and the Editor, and a point by point answer to the Reviewer's and Editor's comments.

When submitting a corrected version of a manuscript after a round of reviews, the Authors must indicate as clear as possible all the changes introduced in the manuscript and how this changes address the points raised by the reviewers. A point by point

response of the Reviewer's questions and comments must also be provided. An exact indication of which modification introduced in the revised version of the manuscript is highly appreciated helps to address each point raised by the Reviewers and can significantly reduce the time of the review process. If requested, reviewers will have access to the other reviewer's comments to understand the changes introduced by the authors during the review process. Normally the revised manuscript should be submitted no later than 4 weeks after the Authors received the comments and suggestions of the Reviewers. If more time is required for manuscript revision, Authors can request an extension to the Editor.

Depending on the decision and the comments raised by the Reviewers, another round of review might be necessary (usually if any of the reviewers suggested rejection or major revision, however the necessity of a second round of reviews is left to the Editor's discretion). If this is the case, the answer to the Reviewer's comments and the corrected version of the manuscript will be returned to all the Reviewers that participate in the first round of review, independently of their recommendation about the article. Again, if requested, all the Reviewers will have access to the comments of the other Reviewers as well as the Author responses for those comments.

There is no a priori limit for the number of review rounds that a manuscript can undergo before being accepted for publication.

If a paper is accepted it will be first published online a few days after the acceptance notification is issued. This fast online publication aims to disseminate the accepted research as fast as possible.

After the end of the peer review process changes cannot be made to the manuscript (other than correcting typos and spelling mistakes). If changes are necessary at this stage the Editorial Committee should be informed. The Editorial Committee will decide if the required changes are acceptable at this point.

Correspondence

Meteorologica will consider for publication Comments on papers that have been published in Meteorologica under the "Correspondence" section. The Editor of the journal determines whether a Comment meets the standards for publication and may reject a Comment without further consideration. If the Editor decides to go forward with consideration of a Comment, a Reply by the author of the paper commented upon

will also be considered for publication. Both Comments and Replies will be refereed to ensure that

- 1) the reply responds directly to the Comment without becoming evasive; and
- 2) the tone of each is appropriate for a scientific journal (see journal *ethics sections* for details)

A Comment will first be sent to the Author of the original paper, who will be given the opportunity to write a Reply. If a Reply is submitted, the Editor will have both the Comment and Reply reviewed. If the the Reply is not submitted, the Editor may proceed without a Reply. Only one referee will be used to review both the Comment and the Authors Reply and only one review round will be possible in this case and in case of acceptance the Comment and the Reply will be published together in the same journal issue.

Peer review times

Time for a manuscript to enter peer reviewing process: 1 week

Time for reviewers to accept or decline reviewing a manuscript: 1 week

Time for reviewing a manuscript: 1 month (*)

Time for making corrections in case of major reviews: 1 month

Time for making corrections in case of minor reviews: 2 weeks

Time for online publication after acceptance: 1 week

(*) If additional reviewers has to be invited this time can be longer.