
Journal of Regulatory Science

Reviewer Information

Journal Description

The Journal of Regulatory Science (JRS) is an online open-access journal intended for scholars with an interest in regulatory science. The JRS publishes free of charge, peer-reviewed scientific manuscripts, proposed standard evaluations and rapid communications to advance the discipline of regulatory science.

The JRS is devoted to the consideration of risk management tools, standards and practices to improve the protection and compliance of regulated products. It is the mission of the Journal of Regulatory Science to facilitate an open dialogue among regulatory scientists from the global community.

The JRS follows a continuous publication model, which allows for quicker publication of manuscripts, benefitting both contributors and readers. Each year, beginning in January, articles will be published throughout the year, as soon as they go through the usual peer review and production process. At the end of the year, the issue will be closed, and the next year's issue will begin again the following January.

The scope of the JRS is comprehensive and includes the regulation of food and feed, the environment, drugs, transportation, communications, and other related fields. Topics addressed by the JRS include:

- Regulation, standardization, and codes practices;
- Harmonization and equivalency;
- Product testing, method development, monitoring and surveillance, researches and technologies for product safety, environment protection, and energy reservation;
- Food contamination and adulteration;
- Consumer, markets, and cost benefit analysis;
- Hazard analysis, HACCP, HARPC, and product safety;
- Risk analysis and communication;
- Quality assurance and control;
- Good manufacturing practices, good laboratory practices, and good clinic practices;
- Gap analysis, implementation, and evaluation of regulatory practices and improvement;
- Environmental control; and
- Education, training, and outreach.

Submissions that do not fulfill these requirements will not be considered for review.

Peer Review Process

The Journal of Regulatory Science is committed to transparency in the review process and aims to provide authors with fair and timely reviews. All submitted manuscripts undergo a single-blind peer review process prior to publication. In a single-blind review system, reviewers are kept anonymous from the authors.

Once an article has been submitted to the JRS, it is first reviewed by the Editor-in-Chief to determine its suitability for publication in the JRS. The Journal Manager then assigns a minimum of two reviewers identified by the Editor-in-Chief as appropriate. Once a minimum of two reviews have been completed,

Journal of Regulatory Science

Reviewer Information

the Editor-in-Chief makes the final decision of acceptance, revision, or rejection based on the reviewer's comments. External referees may be consulted when necessary.

The key criteria for acceptance for publication are:

- Originality, novelty, and appropriateness within the scope of the JRS;
- Broad interest to the regulatory science community;
- Scientific quality and evidence-supported conclusions; and
- Clarity, organization, and completeness.
- Plagiarism

Reviewer Registration

All manuscripts are reviewed online and you must be registered as a reviewer. To register:

1. Complete the registration form posted at:
<https://journals.tdl.org/regsci/index.php/regsci/user/register>
2. Select the "Reviewer" checkbox
3. Identify your reviewing interests
4. Click "Register" to return to your user home page

Conflicts of Interest

Prior to beginning your review, please review the author information for any potential conflicts of interest. A conflict of interest will not necessarily eliminate you from reviewing an article, but reviewers are asked to fully disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest that could inappropriately influence, or be perceived to influence, the review process. Examples of potential conflicts of interests include having a personal relationship with any of the authors, having a direct or indirect financial interest in the article being reviewed, co-authoring publications with at least one of the authors in the past 3 years, or working within the same department or organizational unit as one of the authors within the past 3 years.

Confidentiality

Reviewers are asked to protect the confidentiality of the manuscript to ensure that it is not disseminated or exploited. All manuscripts and information contained therein should remain confidential both during and after the review process. Reviewers should not attempt to contact the author(s).

Criteria for Recommendation

In your evaluation, please consider the originality of the submission, the article's format and structure (as described in the [JRS Author Guidelines](#)), ethical concerns such as plagiarism or fraud.

Review Steps

The editor will send the article review request to selected reviewers by email. The request will include an abstract of the submission, a hyperlink to the submission review page and due date. Reviewers should only accept a request to review when confident that they are able to dedicate an appropriate amount of time to completing the review. The typical period of time allowed for reviews is 4 weeks from the initial review request. Within the online review page, reviewers are directed to:

1. Accept or decline the review
2. Download and review the submission files

Journal of Regulatory Science

Reviewer Information

3. Declare competing interests
4. Post your review of the submission
 - a. Reviewers are presented with two open text boxes, the first "for author and editor," and the second "for editor"
5. Upload any additional files for the editor and/or author
6. Submit review and one of the following recommendations to the editor:
 - a. *Accept submission*
 - b. *Revisions required*
 - c. *Resubmit for review*
 - d. *Resubmit elsewhere (article is archived)*
 - e. *Decline submission*
 - f. *Post comments*

Type	Description	Criteria for Recommendation	Length
Scientific Articles	Presents original work to advance the science of creating tools, standards, and practices to improve the protection and compliance of regulated products. Content is of a strong interdisciplinary interest, or unusual interest to the specialist.	Evaluate the extent to which data and methods substantiate the author's conclusions and interpretations. As appropriate, indicate what additional data and information are needed to validate conclusions or support interpretations.	Up to 10,000 words
Review Articles	Description or evaluation of a book or other materials of interest to the general audience in regulatory science. Should be broad in scope and be of interest to the general audience in regulatory science.	Evaluate the extent to which the data cited or presented justifies the author's conclusions and inferences. The review should cite relevant work and acknowledge the work done by others.	Varies based on content being reviewed
Policy Commentaries	Presents an evaluation of a regulatory standard, impact analysis of a regulatory standard, or related investigations.	Evaluate to what extent the synthesis, arguments, or analysis provides insight on a topic relevant to policy makers. Arguments should flow logically and be supported by recent literature or data and represent an original synthesis.	Up to 8,000 words
Rapid Communications	Presents a singular point of immediate interest to the regulatory community in response to a current or pending incident that may include an inspection technique, analytical procedure, or implications of a policy decision. May contribute to one sub-discipline of regulatory science.	Evaluate to what extent the data cited or presented supports the author's conclusions and interpretations. As appropriate, the review should indicate what additional data and information are needed to validate conclusions or support interpretations.	Up to 4,000 words
Letters to Editor	<i>Considered on a case-by-case basis. Contact the Editor-in-Chief for consideration.</i>		