

Peer Review Process

JFOS ensures a double-blind review process in accordance with the Guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9>). Initially, Editors evaluate the suitability of all submissions for alignment with JFOS's scope and target audience. Papers deemed appropriate are anonymously sent to at least 2 independent expert reviewers to evaluate the scientific quality. Editors are ultimately responsible for the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of articles.

Editors and Reviewers abstain from decisions in cases involving:

1. papers they authored or were authored by family or research group members.
2. papers related to products or services in which they have a commercial interest, funding involvement, or any other conflict of interest.

Independent editors and peer reviewers are invited to handle these submissions, adhering to the blind review process established by standard review procedures. All Editors and Reviewers must carefully check for any conflict of interest before accepting an assignment.

The Editor conducts the initial review to ensure alignment with the journal's subject matter and editorial standards. Preference is given to articles significant and understandable to the IOFOS audience and readers interested in forensic odonto-stomatology, with clear writing and structured study design.

Membership in IOFOS does not influence preliminary selection. IOFOS aims to publish high-quality articles with significant impact. Articles typically take a broad approach.

Reviewers are selected from experts in Forensic Odonto-Stomatology, holding academic degrees and/or positions in teaching or research at universities, academic or governmental institutions, or renowned researchers in the field. Reviewers provide feedback on compliance with the Journal Author's guidelines, novelty of research, validity of experiments, scientific errors, appropriateness of references, soundness of conclusions, originality, and impact in the field of forensic odonto-stomatology and forensic sciences. Reviewers provide comments and final recommendations on whether the paper should be accepted without revisions, resubmitted after revisions, or declined. If there is disagreement among Reviewers' recommendations, the Editor may invite additional reviewers and make a decision based on all recommendations collected.

Results of the peer review process are typically available within three months of submission, though additional rounds of review may extend this timeline. If authors are advised to revise and resubmit a submission, there is no assurance that the resubmission will undergo review by the same reviewers or that the revised submission will ultimately be accepted. Different reviewers may be invited for further rounds of revision.

Articles consistently rejected after peer review include those with a commercial tone, poor writing or organization, elementary content, excessive length, lack of novelty, or deviation from the scope of the journal. Such articles will not undergo re-review by JFOS.