

Resubmissions

In general, rejected papers should not be resubmitted to JSSC as the original decision of the AE and reviewers should be respected. However, there are two cases when a full review of a previously rejected JSSC manuscript is warranted:

1. The paper has been changed so much that it can be considered as a new submission.
2. There is a serious (objective) flaw in the original review process.

Both these cases are extremely rare. The authors need to make the case strongly in either situation, in their documentation during a resubmission. Note that resubmitted papers take up a lot of EiC and AE time and re-submitting rejected papers with minimal updates is a major waste of time for these volunteers.

For resubmissions in the first category, the journal relies on the original AE's judgment on whether the paper is sufficiently new to be considered. We also obtain a second opinion (i.e. not the EiC). This second opinion is provided by another AE. **Responding to original reviewer comments and completely rewriting the paper is NOT sufficient!** Meeting this criteria requires new ideas, and likely new silicon; otherwise the concepts and work is a repackaged version of the already-rejected paper.

For the 2nd category, authors must make the case that the majority of the key points leading to rejection were factually incorrect. In this case two new AEs form a panel to consider the author-provided evidence.

The process therefore is:

1. The resubmission by the authors should include:
 - a. The original manuscript
 - b. The new manuscript with changes highlighted
 - c. The original decision letter along with the reviews
 - d. A document with the author's response to the original reviews. In the 2nd case this should include a detailed description of how the original reviews were objectively flawed/erroneous.
 - e. In the first case: A document summarizing how the resubmission differs from the original submission.
2. The EiC decides whether the resubmission falls into the first or second category. [This should be made clear by authors though]
3. For papers in the first category the EiC first evaluates whether there is *substantial* new content – if not the paper is immediately rejected.
4. The EiC reaches out to the original AE to determine if the new submission is sufficiently different to be considered as a new paper. In addition, a 2nd AE in the area is consulted.
5. If the AEs determine that the paper is sufficiently different to be considered as a new submission, then the original AE sends it out for review.
6. For papers in the 2nd category, two new AEs (not the original AE of the rejected paper) are consulted and asked to consider whether the original review process had egregious errors/flaws. If this is determined to be the case, the new submission is handled by one of these 2 AEs.