

Editorial Process for *GCEJ*

Table of Contents

1. Summary	2
2. Editorial Process Flowchart	2
3. Detailed Instructions	3
3.1 Manuscript Submission	3
3.2 Initial Editorial Check	3
3.3 Peer Review Process	3
3.4 Author Revisions	5
3.5 Final Decision	5
3.6 Author Appeals	5
3.7 Copyediting and Proofreading	6
3.8 Final Publication	6
4. Publishing Standards and Guidelines	6
5. Editorial Ethics	7
6. Post-Publication Issues	8
6.1 Post-publication Critiques Policy	8
6.2 Post-Publication Corrections and Concerns Policy	10
6.3 Retraction Policy	11
7. Revenue Sources Statement	13
8. Advertising Policy	14

1. Summary

The editorial process at the *Global Clinical Engineering Journal (GCEJ)* ensures high standards of quality, fairness, and transparency in the publication of technology, engineering, and informatics related to health, wellness, disease management, and patient-care outcomes around the world. This process outlines key stages, from initial manuscript submission to final publication. To maintain credibility, the journal follows a rigorous double-blind peer-review process, offers an open peer review system, allows for author appeals, and adheres to strict publishing standards and ethical guidelines. The ultimate goal is to facilitate the dissemination of high-impact research that advances the field of clinical engineering. *GCEJ* guarantees that its editorial process and policies strictly follow [The Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing](#), made by COPE, DOAJ, CASPA, and WAME.

2. Editorial Process Flowchart

1. Manuscript Submission

- Authors submit their manuscripts via the online system.

2. Initial Editorial Check

- **Editor-in-Chief** evaluates the scope, formatting, and ethical compliance.

3. Peer Review Process

- Manuscript sent for double-blind peer review.

4. Author Revisions

- Authors revise their manuscript based on review reports.

5. Final Decision

- **Editor-in-Chief** decides to accept or reject.

6. Author Appeals (if applicable)

- Authors can appeal the final decision if needed.

7. Copyediting & Proofreading

- Manuscript edited for clarity, consistency, and grammar-checking.

8. Online First

- Manuscript will be published online first.

9. Final Publication

- The entire issue will be released after all production work is finished.

3. Detailed Instructions

3.1 Manuscript Submission

- **Initial Submission:** Authors submit their manuscripts to the journal via the online portal (<https://globalce.org/index.php/GlobalCE/about/submissions>). Submissions must comply with the *Global Clinical Engineering Journal's* [Instructions for Authors](#) and the journal's scope, focusing on the field of clinical engineering, including technology, engineering, and informatics related to health, wellness, disease management, patient-care outcomes, etc.
- **Prescreening Check:** The manuscript undergoes an initial assessment by the Editorial Team, who will check for compliance with submission guidelines and relevance to the journal's scope. Ethical considerations are also reviewed, especially in research involving human or animal subjects. All manuscripts will be checked for similarity, and the Editorial Team might contact the authors for revision before processing it to the next stage.

3.2 Initial Editorial Check

- **Preliminary Review:** The **Editor-in-Chief** will evaluate the manuscript for scientific merit, novelty, and clarity. If the manuscript passes this review, it proceeds to peer review; if it does not meet the journal's standards, it may be rejected at this stage.
- **Decision on Peer Review:** Manuscripts that meet the initial criteria are sent for peer review. If needed, the editorial team will also suggest reviewers based on the manuscript's subject matter.

3.3 Peer Review Process

- **Double-Blind Review**

The manuscript will be reviewed by at least two external experts in the field (sometimes the Editorial Board Member and **Editor-in-Chief** will review the manuscript, but on most occasions, external reviewers and the experts in *GCEJ's* Reviewer Pool will strictly evaluate the overall quality of submitted manuscripts). During the review process, both the reviewers and authors remain anonymous. Reviewers evaluate the manuscript for scientific rigor, originality, methodological soundness, clarity, and other aspects that are essential for publication quality.

Key review criteria include:

- **Relevance** and **significance** to the field of clinical engineering.

- **Scientific quality and methodological rigor.**
- **Ethical considerations** (e.g., patient consent, ethical approval).
- **Clarity and structure** of the manuscript.
- **Originality and potential impact** on the field.
- **Use of Author-Recommended Reviewers**

Authors may suggest potential reviewers during manuscript submission. However, the **Editorial Office** will independently assess the suitability of all reviewers. We reserve the right **not to use author-recommended reviewers**, especially in cases where conflicts of interest or lack of independence may be suspected.

- **Peer Review of Supplementary Materials**

Supplementary files (e.g., datasets, appendices, multimedia) are routinely subjected to peer review. When they are essential to data interpretation or methodology, reviewers may be invited to evaluate them.

- **Publication of Review Reports**

Review reports are not published alongside the article. If published, authors and reviewers are informed in advance and may be given the option to agree or decline.

- **Decision-Making Process**

Final decisions on manuscripts are made by the **Editor-in-Chief**, in consultation with peer reviewers and, when needed, members of the Editorial Board. All recommendations from reviewers are considered, but the ultimate responsibility for publication decisions rests with the editorial team.

- **Exceptions to Peer Review**

Some manuscript types (e.g., **editorials, letters, interviews, corrigenda, etc.**) may not undergo formal peer review but are subject to editorial evaluation. If an article is published under an alternative or expedited review route, this will be **clearly stated** in the article.

- **Transparency and Communication of Timelines**

We do **not guarantee acceptance** of any initial submission. If there are significant delays during peer review, authors will be notified and given the option to withdraw their submission.

- **Article Metadata and Dates**

All published articles will clearly display the **date of three major steps: received date, accepted date, and date of publication**, to maintain a transparent editorial timeline.

- **Ethical Oversight of the Peer Review Process**

All peer review activity is monitored by the **Editorial Office**. In cases of suspected manipulation or unethical reviewer behavior (e.g., coercive citation), corrective action will be taken in line with COPE guidelines.

3.4 Author Revisions

- **Revisions:** Authors will receive feedback from reviewers and will be given the opportunity to revise their manuscript accordingly. Authors must provide a detailed response letter addressing each reviewer's comment. If authors disagree with a reviewer's comment, they must explain in the response letter and justify their approach.
- **Resubmission:** Revised manuscripts are resubmitted through the online submission system for further review. If needed, the editor will send the manuscript back to the original reviewers for a second round of evaluation.

3.5 Final Decision

- **Academic Decision:** After the review process and author revisions, the **Editor-in-Chief** makes the final decision regarding manuscript acceptance or rejection. If the manuscript meets the journal's standards and the author has adequately addressed reviewer comments, it will be accepted for publication; if the manuscripts need further revision (the **Editor-in-Chief** proposes new comments or requests another round of review), the manuscript will be sent back to the authors for further improvement; if the manuscript's overall quality fails to meet the standard of the Journal, and the **Editor-in-Chief** agrees that in the current stage, it's hard for the authors to make a thorough revision, or their manuscripts have scientific errors, then a decision of rejection will be reached.
 - **Accept:** Manuscript accepted for publication.
 - **Minor Revisions:** Small changes are required before acceptance.
 - **Major Revisions:** Substantial changes needed for further consideration.
 - **Decline:** Manuscript rejected after peer review.

3.6 Author Appeals

- **Appeals Process:** If an author disagrees with the final decision, they may file an appeal (see [GCEJ-Appeal Form](#)). The appeal must be submitted within three months from the decision date, with a detailed justification, including point-by-point responses to the reviewers' and/or Editor's comments.

- **Appeals Review:** The appeal will be reviewed by the **Editor-in-Chief**, and an alternative set of reviewers may be consulted if necessary. Please note that the **Editor-in-Chief's** decision on the appeal is final and cannot be reverted.
- **Grounds for Appeal:** Authors may appeal on grounds of the following factors: potential discrepancies in the review process, unfair treatment, or whether the availability of new data might influence the decision.

For more detailed information, please refer to **Section 7.4 Author Appeals and Ethical Complaints** in *Instructions for Authors*.

3.7 Copyediting and Proofreading

- **Copyediting:** Once accepted, the manuscript will be copyedited by the in-house professionals to improve the overall quality, including language, clarity, grammar, and style. Authors will be requested for their approval in the event of substantial modifications.
- **Proofreading:** After copyediting, the manuscript will be sent back to the authors for final proofreading and confirmation, which includes language and logic checking, tables/figures/equations modification checking, and other final formatting adjustments. The Editors might propose comments to help improve the quality or address unsolved issues, which need the authors' support to revise or reply. Please note that, at this stage, no changes are allowed regarding the authorship, data, or any other important contents in the manuscript, to guarantee the publication ethics and ensure all the basic information and materials have been peer-reviewed.

3.8 Final Publication

- **Online First:** Papers that have been accepted and are currently undergoing layout production will be featured in the "*Online First*" section on the *GCEJ* homepage, making them accessible to the public prior to their inclusion in a formal journal issue.
- **Issue Assignment:** Once papers have been published online, they will be assigned to an appropriate issue in the next volume or issue of the Journal.
- **Open Access:** All papers published in *GCEJ* are open access, ensuring that they are freely accessible to readers worldwide, enhancing widespread dissemination and influence.

4. Publishing Standards and Guidelines

The *Global Clinical Engineering Journal* adheres to strict ethical guidelines and publishing standards to maintain the quality and integrity of its publications. These include:

- **Ethical Supervision:** All manuscripts must comply with the ethical standards, particularly concerning human and animal research. Authors are required to present compelling evidence of ethical approval for research involving human subjects or animal experimentation.
- **Plagiarism Check:** Manuscripts undergo plagiarism detection before being considered for publication. Any submission identified with substantial similarity to previously published content will be declined.
- **Authorship:** All authors must meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria for authorship. The corresponding authors are responsible for confirming that all listed authors in the manuscript have given their consent for inclusion and publication.
- **Conflicts of Interest:** Authors, reviewers, and editors are obligated to disclose any potential conflicts of interest during manuscript submission and, if applicable, throughout the review process.
- **Data Availability:** Authors are encouraged to deposit the data supporting their research in a publicly accessible repository, especially for studies incorporating clinical or patient data.

5. Editorial Ethics

The *Global Clinical Engineering Journal* is committed to maintaining the highest ethical standards throughout the editorial process, which ensures that the peer review process is impartial, transparent, and free from bias. All involved parties, including editors, reviewers, and authors, are expected to adhere to the following ethical guidelines:

- **Impartiality and Objectivity:** All editorial decisions, including Manuscript Acceptance, Rejection, and Revisions, are grounded exclusively on scientific excellence and pertinence to the domain. Editors must ensure that personal relationships or professional interests will not affect their objective decisions.
- **Transparency:** The journal promotes transparency in the editorial process by offering open peer review. All the review and manuscript processing steps will be recorded in the system, with different versions of manuscripts, review comments/reports, editor decisions, etc.
- **Confidentiality:** Editors and reviewers must uphold confidentiality throughout the editorial workflow. Manuscripts should not be shared with individuals external to the peer review procedure.

- **Ethical Review:** Authors are required to provide ethical approval for any studies involving human or animal participants, which should be explicitly stated in the manuscript. Research involving human subjects must comply with the Declaration of Helsinki, and authors must provide documentation of consent from participants (see [*GCEJ-Patient Consent Form*](#)).
- **Conflicts of Interest:** For editors and reviewers, this includes financial relationships, personal connections, or any other factors that could influence impartial decision-making. Authors should disclose conflicts related to funding sources, institutional affiliations, or personal relationships.
- **Plagiarism and Research Misconduct:** *GCEJ* maintains a strict stance against plagiarism and all types of research malpractice, such as data fabrication and falsification. Every manuscript submitted undergoes plagiarism screenings, and any potential misconduct is scrutinized meticulously. Authors proven to have engaged in misconduct will face rejection of their submissions and potential prohibition from submitting further work. Meanwhile, all editors must not get involved in helping authors conduct the above-mentioned misconduct, or falsify the research data.
- **Responsibility for Research Integrity:** The onus of upholding the integrity of the research lies with the authors. Authors are accountable for ensuring the precision and validity of the data and discoveries portrayed in their manuscripts.
- **Corrections and Retractions:** If errors are found in a published paper, either during or after the publication process, *GCEJ* is committed to issuing timely corrections or retractions. This may include Errata, Retractions, or Clarifications as necessary.

6. Post-Publication Issues

6.1 Post-publication Critiques Policy

We support open and constructive post-publication dialogue as an essential element of maintaining research integrity and scholarly exchange, which also follows the [*guidance of COPE*](#). Readers are encouraged to raise questions or concerns about published articles through formal and evidence-based critiques.

- **Definition and Scope**

Post-publication critiques refer to formal, evidence-supported commentaries on previously published articles. These may take the form of:

- Letters to the Editor
- Comments, Commentaries, or Correspondence

- Online responses on moderated platforms (e.g., PubPeer)
- Third-party concerns (e.g., whistleblower reports)
- **Eligibility and Format**
 - Valid critiques must be **well-reasoned, respectfully worded, and supported by evidence** or scholarly argument.
 - Critiques should not contain defamatory, libellous, or unsubstantiated claims.
 - Submissions may include new data or reanalysis **only if relevant** and subject to editorial discretion.
 - Anonymous or pseudonymous critiques may be considered under exceptional circumstances, but the **Editorial Office** reserves the right to verify identities confidentially.
- **Editorial Handling and Author Response**
 - Upon receiving a valid critique, the **Editorial Office** will invite the authors of the original article to provide a formal response within a reasonable timeframe (typically 2–4 weeks).
 - Both the critique and the author’s response will be peer-reviewed if intended for publication.
 - The journal reserves the right to publish the critique with or without a response if the authors choose not to reply.
 - Any resulting corrections, expressions of concern, or retractions will follow COPE’s guidelines and be publicly noted.
- **Timeliness and Limits**
 - There is **no formal time limit** for submitting post-publication critiques. Concerns raised months or years after publication will still be reviewed on merit.
 - A maximum of **two formal critiques** on the same article will typically be considered for publication, unless justified by new evidence or community interest.
 - Word count and reference limits for critiques and replies may apply (e.g., 1,200 words, 15 references), and APCs will not be charged for accepted critiques and replies.
- **Transparency and Indexing**

- Published critiques and replies will be linked to the original article and made **freely accessible**.
- All editorial decisions on critiques and their handling will be recorded and archived in accordance with the journal's transparency standards.
- **Community and Institutional Engagement**
 - Concerns raised via third-party platforms (e.g., PubPeer) will be monitored when feasible.
 - Where appropriate, critiques may trigger further editorial investigation or contact with the authors' institutions.
 - We encourage funders and universities to facilitate constructive post-publication discourse and enable journal-editor contact where necessary.

6.2 Post-Publication Corrections and Concerns Policy

GCEJ is committed to maintaining the integrity and reliability of the academic record. We acknowledge that issues may arise after publication that require correction, clarification, or, in some cases, retraction. Our procedures align with [COPE guidance](#) and aim to ensure the timely and responsible handling of post-publication matters.

- **Core Principles**
 - **Transparency:** All post-publication updates will be clearly labeled and linked to the original publication.
 - **Responsiveness:** The **Editorial Office** will investigate all credible concerns raised by readers, authors, reviewers, or institutions.
 - **Proportionality:** Corrections, Expressions of Concern, or Retractions will be applied based on the severity of the issue and according to COPE flowcharts.
- **Common Post-Publication Actions**

We recognize a range of post-publication interventions, including:

- **Corrigendum:** Correction of author error that does not affect conclusions.
- **Erratum:** Correction of editorial or production error.
- **Addendum:** Supplementary material or clarification.
- **Expression of Concern:** Issued when there are unresolved concerns that may affect the integrity of the work.

- **Retraction:** Used in cases of proven misconduct, significant errors, or ethical breaches that invalidate the article.

We support expanding the taxonomy of correction notices to allow more nuanced and educationally constructive actions, avoiding overly punitive tones when not warranted.

- **Reader and Community Involvement**

GCEJ encourages readers, scholars, and other community members to raise concerns about published content. Concerns may include—but are not limited to—errors, data integrity, authorship disputes, undisclosed conflicts of interest, or indications of misconduct (e.g., fabricated data or paper mill activity).

- Concerns can be submitted confidentially via the **Editorial Office**.
- Anonymous concerns will be considered if supported by specific and credible evidence.
- Review Timeline and Action

Given the increasing speed and scale of challenges posed by emerging issues such as **paper mills** and **generative AI-generated content**, the journal is committed to **swift and thorough evaluation** of post-publication issues. We aim to:

- Acknowledge all valid reports within **5 business days**,
- Begin an internal review process immediately, and
- Provide an update or resolution **within 30 days**, where possible.

- **Preventive Measures and Transparency**

To reduce the likelihood of post-publication issues:

- We encourage **study pre-registration**, where applicable.
- We support **open peer review models** when feasible.
- We actively invest in **educating authors and editors** on ethical responsibilities.
- We strive to **diversify our Editorial Board**, welcoming varied perspectives in decision-making.

6.3 Retraction Policy

GCEJ recognizes the responsibility to maintain the integrity of the academic record. Retraction is an essential mechanism for correcting the literature and alerting readers to publications that contain seriously flawed or unreliable content. The goal of retraction is to preserve trust in scientific publishing, not to punish authors.

- **Purpose of Retraction**

Retractions serve to:

- Correct the literature by removing or flagging seriously erroneous content;
- Alert readers to data or findings that cannot be relied upon;
- Uphold ethical standards of academic publishing.

Retractions may be due to honest error, unintentional oversight, or misconduct, including:

- Major errors that invalidate conclusions;
- Fabrication or falsification of data;
- Plagiarism or redundant publication;
- Copyright infringement or unauthorized use of data;
- Unethical research conduct;
- Compromised peer review or undeclared competing interests that affect the interpretation of results.

- **Criteria for Retraction**

Retraction will be considered when:

- There is clear evidence that the findings are unreliable due to error or misconduct;
- The article reports work that has previously been published elsewhere without proper citation or justification (redundant publication);
- The article includes plagiarized content;
- The content violates copyright or involves unauthorized data/material;
- Ethical approval was not obtained for human or animal research;
- The peer review process has been manipulated or compromised.

Retraction will not be used when:

- There is an authorship dispute, but the findings are sound;
- The evidence of misconduct or unreliability is inconclusive;
- Reported conflicts of interest are unlikely to have influenced the article's conclusions;

- Minor errors or small instances of unattributed text are present (these may be addressed via correction).
- **Retraction Process**
 - The **Editorial Office** will initiate an internal investigation upon receiving credible concerns, following [*COPE flowcharts*](#).
 - Authors will be notified of the concerns and given an opportunity to respond.
 - In cases of suspected misconduct, the authors' institutions may be contacted.
 - The decision to retract will be made by the **Editor-in-Chief** in consultation with the editorial board, and if necessary, the publisher and legal counsel.
- **Retraction Notice**

Each retraction notice shall:

- Be published promptly and be freely accessible;
- Clearly state that it is a **retraction**;
- Specify the **title**, **authors**, and **DOI** of the retracted article;
- Indicate **who is issuing the retraction** (authors, editors, publisher, institution);
- Clearly state the **reason(s)** for retraction and basis for the decision;
- Avoid inflammatory or accusatory language;
- Be linked to the original article, which will be watermarked as “Retracted” but remain accessible for transparency.
- **Additional Considerations**
 - **Retractions apply to the entire article.** Partial retractions are discouraged as they may confuse readers.
 - Where possible, journal staff will attempt to notify **indexing databases** (e.g., PubMed, Crossref) of the retraction.
 - In rare cases, if publication was legally challenged or found to present serious public risk, the full text may be removed from public view with explanation provided.

7. Revenue Sources Statement

GCEJ is published and operated by its publisher, **International Medical Sciences Group, LLC**, which has fully sponsored all operational costs since the journal's inception.

To maintain high-quality editorial services, peer review efficiency, and open access distribution, the journal will adopt a **Gold Open Access (OA)** model starting from **January 1, 2025**. This shift is due to the increasing volume of submissions and the associated rise in editorial and production costs, which can no longer be fully supported by the publisher's existing sponsorship alone.

Under this new model:

- **An Article Processing Charge (APC)** will be applied **only to accepted manuscripts** to cover costs such as editorial handling, peer review management, copyediting, typesetting, content archiving, and long-term open-access hosting.
- **All peer-reviewed content will remain freely accessible to readers worldwide**, without subscription or paywall.
- **Authors who submit before December 31, 2025** will receive **full APC waivers**, regardless of the final acceptance date.
- **Non-peer-reviewed content**, including Editorials, Letters to the Editor, Corrigenda, Addenda, etc., will continue to be published free of charge.
- The journal **remains committed to supporting authors from low- and middle-income countries**, and financial assistance will be provided to eligible authors beyond the transition period to ensure equity and inclusion.
- The journal will **never allow APCs or author payment status to influence editorial decisions**, in full alignment with COPE and DOAJ best practices.

This transition to Gold OA aims to **enhance the journal's long-term sustainability** while upholding the highest standards of academic publishing and broad accessibility to clinical engineering research globally. For more information, please refer to the **Open Access Policy** and **APC Policy**.

8. Advertising Policy

GCEJ accepts **academically relevant and legally compliant advertisements**, particularly those that contribute to scientific communication and professional development in clinical engineering and healthcare technology management.

However, to ensure editorial independence and maintain the trust of our community during the transition period, **no advertisements will appear before December 31, 2025**, regardless of their content or source.

All advertisements, when accepted in the future, will:

- Be **clearly distinguishable** from editorial content.
- Be **independent of editorial decisions** and peer review processes.
- Be **subject to approval** by the **Editorial Office** based on relevance, integrity, and compliance with legal and ethical standards.
- Not influence, or be influenced by, the journal's academic or publication content.