

Key advice for editors in considering appeals for reconsideration of rejected manuscripts*

- Determine whether the reject decision was clearly explained to the author and whether it may have been based on wrong or questionable information, for example, on an incorrect reading of the manuscript or on poor advice from a reviewer.
- Reconsider rejected manuscripts if the author provides good reasons and additional factual input on why the decision may have been wrong. Reversals of decisions without new evidence or information to verify the author's claims should be avoided. The author should also be willing to revise the manuscript in response to the valid comments of the reviewers and/ or editors.
- Encourage resubmission of manuscripts that are potentially acceptable but were rejected because major revision or additional data were required, explaining precisely what is needed to make the manuscript potentially acceptable, and the process and procedures that will be followed in handling the resubmitted manuscript.
- All exchanges between authors and peer reviewers during the peer-review process (including appeals) should be mediated by editors. Editors may seek comments from additional peer reviewers to help them make their final decision.
- If an Editor receives an appeal about a manuscript which is involved in or linked to any sort of litigation (particularly if it is still ongoing) they should contact their Managing Editor at Taylor & Francis in the first instance before responding.
- If an Editor is uncertain on what to do when they receive an appeal or complaint, they are welcome to contact their Managing Editor at Taylor & Francis for support and advice.

The above advice is intended to help Editors handle appeals from authors following a reject decision on their manuscript. We appreciate there are multiple technical and editorial reasons which can lead to a reject decision, and so this is not prescriptive advice on the criteria Editors should use for rejection. Editors can be selective and reject articles which do not meet the journal's standards for scientific significance or novelty in their opinion or that of the peer reviewers.

*This is based on the Council of Science Editor's [White Paper of Publication Ethics](#).