

The Peer Review Process of

„BrewingScience”

([www. brewingscience.de](http://www.brewingscience.de))

(February 2018)

On receipt of an article, the editor will assess its appropriateness for inclusion in the Journal. If the content of the article is appropriate (language, contents, style) and in an acceptable format (size, structure), the editor will send off the article, via e-mail for review. A final decision on acceptance will be made after the submission has been reviewed.

Acceptance or rejection of up to four contributions will be based on the peer review of a submission by at least two members of either the Group of Experts or by others invited to review the article on the grounds of their particular expertise. On receipt of the reviewer comments and recommendations the editor will make a decision to accept, seek revision, or reject a contribution. Contributors will receive a summary of the reviewer comments at the same time as they receive a response from the editor. Copies of reviews and the editors decision will also be sent to each reviewer. It is anticipated that the review process should take from 4 to 6 weeks. If the content or format is inappropriate, the article will be returned to author for revision or with advice of its unsuitability for publication.

The editor will assume that the paper is an original contribution. Papers appearing in the journal should not be published elsewhere without the written consent of the Publisher of the journal.

Checklist for Referees

When refereeing a manuscript, please pay special attention to the following items:

1. The paper should contain scientific matter whose subject is of topical interest and hence worth publishing in BrewingScience.
2. The paper also should contain sufficient new information avoiding
 - redundancy, especially with respect to previous papers,
 - serial publication, e.g. investigations of different substances by the same method.

Usually, manuscripts should not be restricted to a pure description of experimental results added by short phenomenological or qualitative comments only, but authors should also try to include a discussion in the framework of new or existing physical concepts and models.

3. The manuscript should be easily readable concerning language, style and presentation.
4. The title of a paper should be comprehensive, but not too long.

5. References should

- reflect the international state of knowledge (not too many papers of the authors themselves or from sources which are difficult to access, not too old (≤ 10 years) references)
- be sufficiently topical,
- be given in adequate quantity.

6. Formulae should

- correspond to the subject dealt with both in number and quality
- be understandable in their derivation (but trivial steps should be omitted),
- contain only symbols which are explained (not in form of tables). The limits of validity of derivations and results should be given.

7. Figures should be presented in adequate number and be clearly arranged. Photographs should be conclusive and show sufficient contrast.

8. A reasonable relation between scientific content of a paper and its length should be paid attention to.

9. The paper should be clearly organized using suitable subtitles.

10. The abstract should correspond to the contents of the paper and be not too long. It should comprise

- the problem,
- the method,
- essential results.

11. The introduction should contain

- the present state of knowledge (with references),
- the aim of the work.

12. Conclusions, if any, should point to the progress achieved, not repeat the abstract. An example of how your review could look like is given below. Since 2015 the Ludwig Narziß Award for Brewing Science is awarded to the best paper of each year. The award is designed to formally recognize one BrewingScience publication in which the results are particularly relevant for application in the brewing industry (in the broadest sense, including topics in malting, hop processing, packaging, etc.). The author(s) will then be honored with an award.

With respect to the competition for the award, the evaluation process is conducted as part of the normal peer review process, in order to keep the efforts of the review committee members at a manageable level.

As a review committee member, you will therefore receive, in addition to the documents required for the regular peer review process, another form for rating each of the articles to be reviewed. Using this form, you will be asked to rate each entry according to a scale ranging from 0 (least relevant for brewing practice) to 5 (most relevant for brewing practice). Please note that this is not a general evaluation of the quality of the article – the evaluation should

be based solely on the practical relevance of the research results as the only criterion for the award.

Referees Recommendations (example)

1. I recommend that the paper should be
 - (a) accepted as it stands (or with minor editorial modifications). For a manuscript to be acceptable for publication it must be technically correct and it must make an important contribution;
 - (b) accepted conditionally upon its revision by the author to satisfy the detailed criticisms attached. Manuscript should be "accepted conditionally" only, if the final version (upon revision as requested) will be clearly acceptable; otherwise, the recommendation should be to return the manuscript to the author with an invitation to resubmit after extensive revision (see (c));
 - (c) returned to the author with an invitation to resubmit after revision;
 - (d) rejected without invitation to resubmit.

2. The paper
 - (a) is satisfactory in style and presentation;
 - (b) could be shortened appreciably without loss of useful material and without appreciable sacrifice of readability;
 - (c) is badly organized and would profit by rearrangement of material;
 - (d) is unsatisfactory in literary style and requires considerable polishing or even rewriting by the author;
 - (e) suffers appreciably from the fact that the author is writing in a language not his/her own, and should be rewritten with the advice or assistance of someone with a better command of the language used.

3. Referees Comments: (detailed criticism along above checklist)

For further information please contact

Dr. Lydia Junkersfeld

Phone: 0049/911/952 85-58

Fax: 0049/911/952 85-48

junkersfeld@hanscarl.com