



Review process

The intent of the “CIGRE Science & Engineering” journal is to publish high quality papers on current research, development and practical application case studies related to all aspects of electrical power and energy technologies. As such, papers submitted to the journal undergo strict and thorough peer review by some of the most respected international experts in the field. The review process typically does not take more than two months, depending on the current volume of papers under review.

The review process may be summarized as follows:

1. All papers are initially submitted to the journal's chief editor.
2. The chief editor will conduct an initial high-level review to ensure:
 - a. The paper is submitted in the correct format and style (refer to the Submission procedure for “CIGRE Science & Engineering” document: <https://www.cigre.org/GB/publications/cigre-cse>)
 - b. That the paper appears to be of a reasonable quality and scientific value to warrant going through the peer review process. If it is not, the paper may be rejected at this stage with comments sent back to the authors by the chief editor on what needs to be done for the paper to be considered and re-viewed.
3. The chief editor then forwards the paper, with the paper review forms, to the chairperson of the CIGRE Study Committee(s) to which the paper is most closely related.
4. The Study Committee chair(s) then select three (3) experts within the community of experts of the Study Committee(s) to whom the paper is sent, together with the paper evaluation/review form. The three reviewers are then asked to thoroughly review the paper for the following categories:
 - a. Nature of the paper
 - i. Original research
 - ii. Mostly survey
 - iii. Description of an application
 - b. Quality of text
 - c. Interest for Journal readers
 - d. Presentation quality
 - e. Contribution to the state-of-the-art
 - f. Legibility of figures and illustrations
 - g. References to prior work
5. The reviewers will then return their evaluation/review form to the chief editor together with a final recommendation of (i) to publish the paper without changes, or (ii) to be published after corrections, or (iii) to reject the paper. In all cases, the reviewer must also provide a detailed explanation of their recommendation.
6. The chief editor, together with the appropriate Study Committee chairperson(s) makes the final decision and communicates the outcome to the author(s). The identity of the reviewers is kept confidential.
7. If a paper is revised and resubmitted based on corrections suggested by the reviewers, typically the same reviewers are then asked to re-review the paper.